

If Peace Now had really wanted to achieve sustainable peace in the foreseeable future, they would have achieved more by infiltrating and militarizing the Kach movement. courage to strike Iran before it has a chance to kill a few hundred thousand Americans. Judging from our 9/11 experience, the United States will not respond adequately after the attack either. The best we can expect from the most hawkish administration imaginable is an attempt to liberate the proud Iranian people from the tyranny of the ayatollahs — provided the United Nations endorses such a drastic step. If we are lucky, we will manage to eventually plunge Iran into a civil war, like we did with Iraq. If not, we will just suffer yet another unmitigated embarrassment, which isn't really such a big deal, because even a superpower can only lose face once, and we are about to mark the fifth anniversary of that event. In either case, we will give the Muslims proof, once again, that they can attack the United States and get away with it.

Thus, utterly inhumane regimes like Russia and China brilliantly succeed in achieving virtually impenetrable security for themselves without wasting a single life on either side of their border. This proves beyond any doubt that readiness to reduce the enemy to radioactive ashes at the slightest provocation guarantees peace much better than successful efforts of seventy-seven generations of pacifists.

Such is the price of our misguided humanism. If Peace Now had really wanted to achieve sustainable peace in the foreseeable future, they would have achieved more by infiltrating and militarizing the Kach movement.

Let us now address the concerns of Mr. Walter Murray of Palo Alto. He certainly deserves a carefully considered answer. However, I am reluctant to dive into the murky depths of a Jewish emotional response to the murder of children, Jewish or otherwise. Instead, I would like to point out the following:

First, Mr. Murray, has failed to tell us why he expects the Jews to relate to dead children in a different way than, let's say, Ukrainians, Arabs, or, for the sake of argument, Irish Americans. To me, such an assumption of inherent distinctions between Jews and normal people, just like Yulia's assertion of the superiority of Jewish intellect, reeks of anti-Semitism. Obviously, Mr. Murray has nothing against kikes — as long as they behave according to his expectations. Mr. Murray's granddaddy, most probably, had nothing against niggers — as long as they kept their proper place.

Please, Mr. Murray, don't protest; don't tell us that some of your closest friends are Jewish. If you don't trust my diagnosis, ask some of your closest friends who are black (I'm sure you have some) if they have ever run into a white racist who didn't even suspect he was a racist.

Second, I strongly advise you, Mr. Murray, not to mourn dead children indiscriminately. You will most probably find what I am about to say monstrously cynical, but I am nevertheless going to say it.

Suggestions to the Crucified

by Zack Lieberberg

Translated by Yashiko Sagamori
August 29, 2006

© 2002—2005 Yashiko Sagamori. All rights reserved.

[Part one]

I would like to bring to your attention just two of the huge number of readers' responses to The Disproportionate Nation. Both were found on blogs where Yashiko's article was reproduced. The first one came from a Russian lady who signed only her first name, Yulia:

You are the smartest nation on earth. You mustn't behave like barbarians. You should find a better, more effective and humane method to fight against those who wish to destroy you.

The other was written by Mr. Walter Murray from Palo Alto: The death of any child should be regretted by Jews just as much as that of a Jewish child. If you don't hold that view maybe that is part of the problem.

The reason I chose these two comments, out of many, is because I found depth in them that may be overlooked at first reading. Yulia, for example, despite (or because of?) her self-proclaimed intellectual inferiority, expresses an interesting belief. She thinks that Jews have an obligation to be more humane than the rest of the species. On the other hand, Mr. Murray's attempt to analyze Jewish emotions and stir them into a proper direction implies a perception of superiority, both moral and intellectual, which he chose not to express explicitly, whether out of modesty or, probably, due to the common aversion among the members of Mensa to stating the obvious.

Let us first talk about humanism. You have probably noticed that in the unfolding

Iranian nuclear crisis, Russia and China are doing everything they can to impede American attempts to curb the danger coming from the rabid mullahs. This is not surprising, since the obvious American inability to handle this crisis efficiently erodes whatever little is left of our superpower status and, therefore, serves the interests of our adversaries. But isn't nuclear Iran as dangerous for Russia and China as it is for the United States?

No, it is not, and here is why. The ayatollahs know perfectly well that the moment Russia or China feels really threatened by Iran, they will survive exactly as long as it takes for the first salvo of Russian or, respectively, Chinese nuclear missiles to reach Iranian territory, which is somewhere between 12 and 37 minutes, depending on where the rockets would be launched from. After that, the land we call Iran today, will be forever known as the Great Persian Desert and populated exclusively by mutant cockroaches.

The United States, on the other hand, will do everything in its power to avoid any such extremes by adhering to the letter and spirit of international law. It will, most probably, once again bring the problem of an imminent Iranian threat to the UN Security Council, which is not really famous for the efficiency of either producing or implementing solutions to international crises. Considering that the United Nations are mostly united in their hatred of Israel and the United States, there is no reason to be optimistic about the probable outcome of such measure, which means that sooner or later an Iranian nuclear device will be successfully tested on our soil.

It's bad enough that the US government will never have the courage to strike Iran

before it has a chance to kill a few hundred thousand Americans. Judging from our 9/11 experience, the United States will not respond adequately after the attack either. The best we can expect from the most hawkish administration imaginable is an attempt to liberate the proud Iranian people from the tyranny of the ayatollahs — provided the United Nations endorses such a drastic step. If we are lucky, we will manage to eventually plunge Iran into a civil war, like we did with Iraq. If not, we will just suffer yet another unmitigated embarrassment, which isn't really such a big deal, because even a superpower can only lose face once, and we are about to mark the fifth anniversary of that event. In either case, we will give the Muslims proof, once again, that they can attack the United States and get away with it.

Thus, utterly inhumane regimes like Russia and China brilliantly succeed in achieving virtually impenetrable security for themselves without wasting a single life on either side of their border. This proves beyond any doubt that readiness to reduce the enemy to radioactive ashes at the slightest provocation guarantees peace much better than successful efforts of seventy-seven generations of pacifists.

Such is the price of our misguided humanism.

Seventy years ago, you were killing us at the hands of the Germans. Today, you are killing us at the hands of the Arabs. Today, like on the eve of World War II, you feel comfortably safe and superior to both the aggressors and their victims. You shouldn't. After all, you must know that the 6 million Jews killed by Nazi Germany constituted less than 10% of all casualties of that war. But Germans were across the ocean, while today your enemies — uncounted millions of them — have already landed on your shores. How far is your comfortable home from the nearest mosque?

And yet, you continue to confuse non-resistance to aggression with peace. You and your kind, Mr. Murray, are the reason World War II and the world war that officially came to the United States on September 11, 2001, became possible. You are a stupid, immoral, cowardly monster.

How dare you tell Jews how they should feel about their murdered children?

Translated by Yashiko Sagamori
August 29, 2006

© 2002—2005 Yashiko Sagamori. All rights reserved.

Available on the web, with active links here:

http://middleeastfacts.com/yashiko/Suggestions_eng.html

Links from the original document:

http://middleeastfacts.com/yashiko/Disproportion_eng.html

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mensa_International

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace_Now

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kach_movement

This flyer is one of many available from Crusader's Armory. Click the Flyers To Print link; download, print and distribute them freely for non-commercial use.

You will also find Qur'an & Hadith and links to online versions and links to several on line petitions worthy of your support at:

<http://www.geocities.com/crusadersarmory/>

Suggestions to the Crucified

by Zack Lieberberg

Translated by Yashiko Sagamori
August 29, 2006

© 2002—2005 Yashiko Sagamori. All rights reserved.

[Part two]

You see, the probability that an Arab child will grow up and becomes an Albert Einstein, or Sigmund Freud, or even Alan Greenspan, is equal to the twelfth digit after the decimal point, to the probability that a Jewish child will grow up to become a jihad fighter. Of course, not every Jewish child becomes an Einstein, and not every Arab child chooses a brief but spectacular career of a shahid. However, Jewish children, if you don't kill them before it's too late, form Jewish communities, and Jewish communities, in addition to producing Einsteins from time to time, are known throughout the entire history of the Diaspora for bringing prosperity to every society that allows them to prosper.

“I will bless those who bless you.”

Unlike Jews, Arabs do not form communities; instead, they form the “Arab street”. The “Arab street” has never produced an Einstein and, I am sure never will. Instead, it is producing an abundance of mass murderers.

The way I see it, the problem does not arise because of the way Jews discriminate between dead children. The problem arises because of the way you discriminate between them. More specifically, had you mourned dead Jewish children the way you would (God forbid!) mourn your own children, there would have been no problem whatsoever. But you don't, and this creates an enormous problem, to which you are oblivious, because, in your mind, that problem exists only for the Jews. Let me outline the problem for you.

Seventy years ago, the world idly watched Hitler preparing the Holocaust. When it was well under way; when thousands of European Jews, including children, were dying in the gas chambers of German camps every hour, people like you feigned ignorance and pretended that it had nothing to do with them. Like good Christians, you were busy loving your enemies while your enemies were exterminating us at the full power of their industrial capacity.

You are doing exactly the same thing today. Your enemy is openly declaring its intentions to exterminate the Jews. Your enemy has been openly waging a war of annihilation against Israel since the day Israel was reinstated on a small portion of its historic homeland. Your enemy kills Jews every year — dozens of them during a lull; hundreds during an “intifada”. Most of those Jews are civilians. Many of them are the elderly. Many are children. All of them are targeted deliberately. What do you do in response? Do you invoke Geneva conventions? Do you express moral outrage? No. You berate Israel for a disproportionate response; for needlessly killing innocent civilians; for the ongoing occupation; and label Israel, as a result, as the main enemy of the humankind. And, of course, every Jew in the world automatically becomes complicit in the Israeli crimes against humanity.

What innocent civilians? After 9/11, even you should understand that no one is innocent any longer — not you, not me, and, definitely, not those who are trying to destroy us. Look at yourself in the mirror — you are not innocent; you are defenseless. In this war of civilizations, you are a perfectly legitimate

target, no matter what the Geneva Conventions tell you, because your enemies do not concern themselves with infidel laws.

What crimes? Since when has it been a crime to defend oneself against aggression? What international law demands that the victim of aggression stop the war when the enemy body exceeds the level at which you still feel comfortable?

What occupation? What “Palestinian people”? Learn some real history. The “Palestinian people” is a blood libel, next to which the infamous Protocols look almost inoffensive. I challenge you to produce a single pre-1967 reference to the “Palestinian people”. I challenge you to name at least one document that gives the terrorist organization you call the “Palestinian people” the legal right to one square inch of territory in Israel or anywhere else in the world.

If you believe — like I do — that innocent people should have a right to live where they have always lived without UN approval, I will have to ask you why you have never protested against the eviction of almost a million Jews from their homes in Arab countries where they had lived for centuries before those lands fell to Arab occupation. I will also ask you what happens to the right of an innocent person to live in the place of his choice after that innocent person blows up a school bus with neighbor's children.

Where was your concern for dead children when Arabs, year after year, decade after decade, kept deliberately murdering Jewish children? Where was your concern for Jewish children when Hezbollah attacked

And now comes the most interesting part. My Arab critics provided a link to an article posted on the ADC site outlining the Arab contribution to the progress of humankind. There, I found such an impressive list of names and achievements that I am unable to resist the temptation to comment on it. I will begin with the area in which I am less ignorant than in most others — mathematics. Here's what it says about Arab contribution to mathematics:

In mathematics, the Arab sifr, or zero, provided new solutions for complicated mathematical problems. The Arabic numeral — an improvement on the original Hindu concept — and the Arab decimal system facilitated the course of science.

Having read that, I opened Wikipedia and looked for Arabic numerals. Here's what I found:

The numbers were developed in India by the Hindus around 400 BCE. However, because it was Arabs who relayed this system to the West after the Hindu numerical system found its way to Baghdad, the numeral system became misidentified as “Arabic” in the eyes of the Europeans. Arabs themselves call the Eastern Arabic numerals “Indian numerals,” ... (arqam hindiyyah).

People with limited understanding of the foundations of mathematics may find it hard to appreciate, but the realization that zero was a number was a monumental

breakthrough in mathematics that can be compared to the invention of the wheel. That's why I suggest that you look at another Wikipedia article, 0 (number), and see for yourself that the Arab participation in the introduction of zero was exactly zero. The ADC article doesn't say exactly how Arabs improved “on the original Hindu concept”, and here's why: once someone shows you how to use the ten digits to write down numbers, that's it; there is no room for improvement. The only zero the Arabs gave us is Ground Zero in Manhattan.

Equally untrue is that:
The Arabs invented and developed algebra... Al-Khwarizmi, credited with the founding of algebra...

First of all, algebra is a science and not a natural phenomenon or a machine. Therefore, it could be neither discovered, nor invented. It could only be founded, the way geometry, for example, was founded by Euclid, who not only formulated its axioms, but developed the very foundation of mathematical thinking. Al-Khwarizmi did nothing of the kind. He found a method of solving quadratic equations and formulated rules for long arithmetical operations. Although the concept of algorithm emerged many centuries later, those rules could, in some way, be considered algorithms, and his contribution was marked by deriving the term algorithm from his name. Similarly, the word algebra derives from the title of his book, ?????????? ... — al-Kitab al-mukhtasar fi hisab al-jabr wa'l-muqabala or The Compendious Book on Calculation by Completion and Balancing. Let me remind you, however, that America was not discovered by Amerigo Vespucci after whom it was named.

Less than Zero

by Zack Lieberberg

Translated by Yashiko Sagamori
September 11, 2006

© 2002—2005 Yashiko Sagamori. All rights reserved.

[Part one]

My last article, Suggestions to the Crucified, attracted attention beyond my usual circle of readers. Fragments of it, with comments, were posted on Sabah's Blog under a headline reading "From the annals of racism in the 21st century", and reproduced on quite a few anti-American, anti-Semitic sites, whose names ranged from uninviting, like Mahmood's Den, to meaningless, like Planet Jordan (Does that have anything to do with the recent demotion of Pluto?) promising a visitor "Your Daily Portion of Jordanian Wisdom", to outright misleading, like Exposing Corruption.

In fairness to my opponents, they didn't just call me a racist. They offered experimental proof for their statements. They quoted a passage from my article and suggested replacing every occurrence of the word Arab in it with the word nigger. Of course, even the NAACP charter will sound outright racist if you subject it to a similar process. Nevertheless, I honestly tried; here's what came out of it:

Unlike Jews, niggers do not form communities; instead, they form the "nigger street". The "nigger street" has never produced an Einstein and, I am sure, never will. Instead, it is producing an abundance of mass murderers.

Aside from the unfortunate terminology, one thing is immediately obvious in the modified passage. The original was true. The substitution has rendered it utterly false. To the best of my knowledge, there is no such phenomenon as a "nigger street", while references to the "Arab street" and its opinions are readily available in the media. As a matter of fact, black people do form

communities. And although statistics of violent crime in predominantly black urban areas remain higher than in predominantly white upper-middle-class suburbs, mass murderers, at least in the United States, are overwhelmingly white. The only exception that comes to mind are the "Beltway sniper", John Muhammad, and his sidekick, Lee Malvo. But those people were converts to Islam, which kind of makes my point rather than my critics'. As to future black Einsteins, I am optimistic. Twenty years ago, it was impossible to imagine a black Secretary of State — not that I am terribly happy with the performance of the current one, or several of her predecessors regardless of their skin color and gender,

However, I might have been more precise in my language. I definitely wasn't talking about Arabs like Joseph Farah, one of the most talented and honest journalists in this country, or Dr. Wafa Sultan, who had courage to openly and convincingly challenge the Islamic establishment on its own turf. Actually I wasn't talking about Arabs exclusively. I was talking about Muslims — excuse me — observant Muslims. Discussing World War II, I might have spoken similarly about the Germans while meaning the Nazis and not meaning those ethnic Germans who opposed Fascism while it was devastatingly powerful, although Nazism never presented as imminent a threat to our existence as does Islam today.

I hope I haven't created an impression that I am trying to defend myself here. I don't think there is any need for defense. People accusing me of racism routinely greet each other with the words, "May you kill a Jew before you die". They call Jews "children of apes and pigs". They consider "infidels", in general, and Jews, in particular, subhuman and

don't even try to keep that belief a secret. They kill us at every opportunity and without any specific reason; they believe that, as Muslims, they have a license to kill us. They adhere to ideology demanding them to destroy not just Israel with its entire population, but every culture that exists in this world except their own — even though the latter can be called a culture by anthropologists only. They openly and proudly admit their intention to Talibanize the entire world. Accusations of racism coming from them are as ludicrous as calls for abstinence coming from a retired prostitute who is now running a brothel.

Nevertheless, some of their arguments are worth looking at. For example, they quoted out of context some of the great Jews I mentioned in my article and made them sound anti-Zionist. That should have been a devastating blow to everything I wrote, but it wasn't. I am not going to delve into analysis of Einstein's views on Israel (he wasn't anti-Israel), Zionism (he wasn't anti-Zionist) or any other subject. I will merely state that Einstein was one of the greatest physicists of all times. That was the extent of his prominence — and his license. I wouldn't seek his advice if I was having marital problems; I wouldn't expect him to be able to fill a dental cavity; I wouldn't rely on his opinion when it came to politics, either.

Here's another question for the ethicists. When someone hates the enemies of his country and his people, does that make him a racist? And if he doesn't hate them, then what does that make him?

Original article:

http://middleeastfacts.com/yashiko/Zero_eng.html

Links in the original:

http://middleeastfacts.com/yashiko/Suggestions_eng.html

<http://sabbah.biz/mt/archives/2006/08/31/from-the-annals-of-racism-in-the-21st-century/>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Muhammad

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Farah

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wafa_Sultan

<http://www.adc.org/index.php?id=247>

<http://www.wikipedia.org/>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arabic_numerals

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/0_%28number%29#History

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Euclid>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Khwarizmi>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amerigo_Vespucci

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Khwarezm>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zoroastrianism>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-biruni>

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Al-Farghani>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ibn_sina

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Musa_ibn_Shakir

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ibn_Battuta

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berber>

Translated by Yashiko Sagamori

September 11, 2006

© 2002—2005 Yashiko Sagamori. All rights reserved.

This flyer and more are available for download & distribution under the Flyers To Print link at <http://www.geocities.com/crusadersarmory/> where you will find Qur'an, Hadith, links to on line versions and links to on line petitions worthy of your support.

Less than Zero

by Zack Lieberberg

Translated by Yashiko Sagamori
September 11, 2006

© 2002—2005 Yashiko Sagamori. All rights reserved.

[Part two]

It would be impossible to disagree that, against the intellectually barren background of the Muslim world, al-Khwarismi does look like a giant. However, he didn't found algebra or anything else of any importance to us. Without him, algebra today would have been exactly what it is. You can't state the same about geometry and Euclid or physics and Newton.

Also interesting is the fact that al-Khwarismi wasn't even an Arab. He was Persian.

Al-Khwarismi is not his surname; it is a descriptor defining him as a native of the ancient city of Khwarezm, or Khorezm, which still exists today and is located in the territory of modern Uzbekistan, formerly a part of Persian empire. Some hints point at the possibility that his family followed not Islam, but Zoroastrianism —, a religion virtually exterminated by Muslims today.

Many, if not most, of the other great “Arab” scientists listed in the article were not in fact Arabs either. Al-Biruni, al-Farghani (meaning from Fergana, also in Uzbekistan), al-Razi, Ibn Haytham, Ibn Sina, Musa bin Shakir and his three famous sons — were Persians. Ibn Battuta was a Berber. But their ethnicity is not as important as the chronology of their achievements. Even if you decide to accept everything in that self-congratulatory article for fact, you can't help noticing that none of the Arabic “contributions” listed there is less than 350 years old. Why?

The ADC article provides a hint. Here's what it says:

To be Arab, then [between 7th and 13th centuries CE – ZL] as now, was not to come from a particular race or lineage. To be Arab, like American, was (and is) a civilization and a cultural trait rather than a racial mark. To be Arab meant to be from the Arabic-speaking world – a world of common traditions, customs and value – shaped by a single and unifying language.

The Arab civilization brought together Muslims, Christians and Jews. It unified Arabians, Africans, Berbers, Egyptians, and the descendants of the Phoenicians, Canaanites, and many other people.

Let me translate this into plain English for you. To be Arab means to conquer every nation that can be conquered and claim its historic achievements as if they belonged to Arabs from the beginning of time. Why not? According to the teachings of Islam, Adam and Eve, Abraham and Moses, Jesus and you are Muslims. Yes, you too, because Islam teaches that every human being is created Muslim. The Arab civilization does bring together Christian, Jews, and an ever growing list of other peoples. It brings them together in the mass grave of their destroyed civilizations, never bothering to ask whether those people ever wanted to be brought together by Arabs or anyone else.

The most interesting aspect of this is that Arabs sincerely believe that they save those they conquer from the darkness of eternal ignorance.

I remember reading somewhere that Egyptian peasants living today along the shores of the Nile are still using the same primitive irrigation devices that were used by their ancestors in Egypt 5,000 years ago. I believe that people who, in the course of 5 millennia, have failed to improve primitive, prehistoric technology, upon which their survival immediately depends, can be reasonably called primitive.

Actually, it's worse than that. Today's Egyptians have nothing to do with the builders of the pyramids. Today's Egyptians are Arabs. Their ancestors did not live along the Nile. Arabs invaded, occupied and conquered Egypt in the middle of 7th century CE, 20 short years after the invention of Islam. They invented Islam, but Inventing or even improving the water wheel was beyond their ability to create.

I don't mean to say that Islam does not stimulate our own creativity. Without it, our engineers would not have had reasons to invent ways to tell baby formula from explosives. Without it, our ethicists would not have to decide whether profiling Muslims is morally and legally admissible. Considering that all terrorists in the modern world are Muslims, I would say that we should not profile them. We shouldn't allow Islam — the greatest global humanity has ever faced — on our soil either. Without Islam, we would have been as safe from terrorist attacks on our soil today as we thought we were 5 years and one day ago, on the eve of 9/11.