

Why?

February 08, 2017

Why?

(Lessons learned between 2009-2016)

It now could be written as part of American history: on December 23, 2016, the United States government, under Barack Hussein Obama abstained from blocking Resolution 2334 at the United Nations Security Council. By doing so, the US government allowed the UN Security Council to pass the Resolution that describes Israel's settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem as illegal and an obstacle to peace with the Palestinians. This was –probably- the last anti-Israel move Barack Hussein Obama and his government had done against Israel.

This occasion once again shines the light on a question: why large part of the American Jewish community had not seen this coming in 2008, why –having four years worth of empirical, incontrovertible data at hand- voted for him in 2012, and why the liberal Jewish community was (lead by Rabbis such as Rabbi Stefan Weinberg, Rabbi Elana Zelony, and others) mourning the loss of Hillary R. Clinton's presidential bid, who – among other of her documented shortcomings- promised the “third term of Obama policies.”

Why?

To expand the scope, the appropriate question could be asked: why the Jewish community's liberal wing keeps aligning itself with philosophies that are in diametric opposition with basic Jewish tenets, and –as an extension of the question- assisting (“voting”) its own destructors into power.

Why?

In trying to formulate a rational answer, let us work from a specific case (the Obama presidency) to the general argument. While (in 2008) the Kadima Party-ran government and Shimon Perez were trying to get the Palestinians to the negotiating table, Obama said this: *“There is a strain within the pro-Israel community that says unless you adopt an unwavering pro-Likud approach to Israel that you're anti-Israel;”* the Obama government (in 2009) joined the famously anti-Semitic United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC). In that move, his Secretary of State, Hillary R. Clinton said: *“Human rights are an essential element of American global foreign policy;”* in the same year (2009) Barack Hussein Obama said the following in his Cairo speech about Palestinians victimized by the Jews: *“They endure the daily humiliations – large and small – that come with occupation. So let there be no doubt: the situation for the Palestinian people is intolerable. America will not turn our backs on the legitimate Palestinian aspiration for dignity, opportunity and a state of their own;”* Obama also told the UN: *“America does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements;”* in 2011, the Hillary R. Clinton ran State Department labeled Jerusalem as not part of Israel and in December, Hillary R. Clinton accused Israel of moving in the *“opposite direction of democracy;”* at the December, 2012 Saban Forum, Hillary R. Clinton stated that *“Israelis have a lack of empathy for Palestinians,”* and that the Israelis need to *“demonstrate that they do understand the pain of an oppressed people in their minds;”* came 2014, when Barack Hussein Obama personally stepped in and blocked the Pentagon Hellfire missile shipment to

Why?

February 08, 2017

Israel. It happened in the middle of Israel-Gaza conflict; in January, 2015 Barack Hussein Obama midwived a group named "One Voice" with the objective of defeating PM Netanyahu at the Israeli (a sovereign nation) election. The group was lead by Jeremy Bird, Obama's 2012 campaign field director. After PM Netanyahu won the election in March, Barack Hussein Obama refused to call and congratulate him for two days. When he did, he threatened to remove American support in the international community.

There were a list of (well documented) insults and actions to undermine the Israeli government and PM Netanyahu; this included (although the list is far from complete) VP Biden ripping into Israelis, Hillary Clinton yelling at PM Netanyahu, accusing him, that he had "*harmed the bilateral relationship*," PM Netanyahu was forced by Barack Hussein Obama to leave the White House through the side door, the Pentagon leaked information on Israel's deal with Saudi Arabia, Obama refused to prevent an Arab referendum about Israeli nuclear capacity, White House leaked about Israel sponsoring Mujahideen-e-Khalq, the Iranian opposition group, and they leaked the existence of an Israeli airfield in Azerbaijan.

Without practicing partisan politics, but using empirical data, we can safely conclude that Barack Hussein Obama was "the" most anti-Israel president in US history. Some people (as if it was a sufficient defense) reply with "Yet, he gave a lot of money to Israel." Studying the matter one can conclude Obama had nothing, or precious little, to do with that funding. The framework that laid out the US financial aid to Israel was signed on August 16, 2007, by the President G.W. Bush government and Israel, providing financial aid to Israel for ten years (until 2017).

What happened in 2012 made this discussion highly relevant. While 78% of the American Jewish community voted for Obama in 2008, and 69% of them still voted for him in 2012, Obama kept his anti-Israel policies and actions running. Came November 2016; 70% of the Jews voted for Hillary R. Clinton, who went on record multiple times promising the "third term of Obama." Obama –apparently wanting to express his appreciation for the Jewish community's strong, unwavering support- orchestrated Security Council Resolution 2334.

The rapid sequence of events within a relatively short time have shone the light on the unmistakable philosophical, intellectual, ethical and moral gap the American Jewish community's liberal wing and its leaders have been portraying for decades. It also raises the central question: why a Jew becomes liberal, when liberalism is the diagonal opposite to everything the Jews have been standing for over 4,000 years? Someone, some time will ably research this topic and write a five hundred page book on the finding; we obviously have neither the time nor the space to do it here.

Maybe the best way to demonstrate the wide divergence between "liberalism" and Jewish cultural, historical and religious fabric is through some interesting data: while Jews represent 0.02% of the global population, there have been 129 Noble Prizes awarded to Jews. Of the 129, only eight were a "Peace Prize," while fifty-two were Physics, and forty-four for Medicine. This is fundamental, because it is as objective as it gets, and it is global. The deep roots this data grew out of is that Jews thrive for excellence and continuously train to be

Why?

February 08, 2017

excellent. It begins with a thirteen year old boy or girl placed before the Congregation to read and pray in Hebrew. One can find 4,000 years of long educational, cultural and religious roots in the fact that Goldman Sachs' top three executives' names are Blankfein, Solomon and Schwartz; or the fact that Mr. Solomon and Mr. Schwartz were recently elevated to their positions when Pres. Trump invited Mr. Cohn into his administration. It is important to mention for this reason: while every fiber in a Jewish body is about "excellence," liberalism is about "average." About the "lowest common denominator." About being "equal." This "being equal" thesis covers (among others) sport, education and (newly attempted) bathroom policies. It encompasses all aspects of life starting in kindergarten. While a thirteen years old Jewish boy or girl is studying for his/her "big day," the liberal system (from age two on) is brainwashing kids by not naming a "winner" in a sport (or any other) competition, not wanting to "hurt the feelings of the losing side." One can reasonably wonder why liberal Jews subscribe to a philosophy polar opposite to their religion, cultural and historical backgrounds, and 4,000 year old roots; their very being and very existence? Why?

The culmination point how the Jewish religion teaches exceptionalism, while liberal Jews subscribing to "equality" is the economical foundation of "equality" and how this equality invariably ends up in "dictatorship." The road that starts with "equality," runs through "liberalism," "progressivism," "socialism" and invariably ends up in "dictatorship." This road is paved with economical delusions translated into social and political paradigm. The basis of this problem well captured by Thomas Jefferson (*"The democracy will cease to exist when you take away from those who are willing to work and give to those who would not."*) and Lady Margaret Thatcher (*"The trouble with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money"*). I actually think the two quotes should be placed in reverse order; *"Once you have run out of other people's money, democracy will be endangered because you will have to take from those who are willing to work and give to those who are not."* It is not difficult and complex to understand, that one can have a two employee company, a 100,000 employee company, a small/large charity organization or lead a small/large country; one factor cannot be circumvented: the created value of the given organization must be equal or larger than the spent value; otherwise the organization will cease to exist. It's just that simple. The problem (no liberal will ever understand) that as human nature dictates, most people would rather live at a lower living standard if it was financed by someone, then work for a higher one. Throughout the last century, there were many attempts to try equalism that manifested itself in socialistic (i.e. "income equality") ideas. Every single one of them failed, at every single time because of one contradiction: "human nature" vs. "...created value of a given organization must be equal or larger than the spent value..." The split second, when people continuously receive goods (of any kind) without continuously earning it, people consider it as a "given," as "it is owed to them" and they will behave accordingly. This will invariably generate tension in the society where different groups (the "takers") will use different "reasons" to go on the streets protesting against the "earners" to protect their lifestyle, which is based on "getting things without earning them." The society and its leaders can manage this while money is available. Once they "ran out of other people's money," measures must be taken to generate the money somewhere; enters Thomas Jefferson's *"The democracy will cease to exist when you take away from those who are willing to work and give to those who will not."* It is safe to argue that most leaders of these societies started with "good intentions" (to "help people") and invariably ended up with an "ends justify the means" dictatorship. *Equalism by its very nature contains dictatorship and unlawful society as a tool to serve the dictator. That's a given.* It is all in Thomas Jefferson and Lady Thatcher's warning: someone must create the value. The American Jewish population (as the extension of seeking excellence) almost exclusively belongs to the "earner" category. Which means once the government ran out of other people's money" the Jews are in the front-line of "sourcing money by various other means." Yet they support liberals. Why?

Why?

February 08, 2017

It is equally interesting to wonder why liberal Jews accept and support philosophies having no reason, common sense, and are against basic Jewish tenets to begin with. Maybe the two best examples are “gun control” and the “how did Clinton loose the election” topics. The gun control issue is more succinct and more rooted in Jewish historical background. There is no other ethnic group or religion that has been more persecuted throughout history than the Jews. The “one must defend oneself and one’s family” must be in every fiber of a Jewish body. This is the very concept Jews have been living with (or under) in Israel on a daily basis since 1948. If you look at the heart and soul of the “gun control” issue, liberal Jews (again) represent the opposite of what is in their historical and cultural roots. “Guns kill!” as the liberal argument goes. They also say, “the more guns, the more people will be killed.” The only problem with this thesis, is that history has been proving the opposite; on both counts. The first: “guns don’t kill; people do.” Which leads us to the second: if there was a grain of truth in it, then people would mass-kill each other in Israel, or in Switzerland (where it is mandatory to keep an army provided gun or rifle at home) for that matter. I wonder how a liberal Jew can be for gun control; look into anyone’s eyes among the relatives left behind in the Colorado Theater, in the Charleston, S.C. Church, or in the Miami gay club, and sleep well at night. My argument with regards to this entire gun issue is not “gun-control” related; it has everything to do with the vastly unreasonable, without merit, against any credible evidence, facts and data, liberal reasoning. For Jews, the historical backdrop gives one more, ever-significant element to that mix.

The other element is the “Clinton issue”. On the one hand, no other religion regulates and controls the every day life of its faithful more than Judaism. If there ever was a religion that taught its faithful to obey and live by the law, Judaism is “the” one. In fact, “the” only reason why Jews survived thousands of years of persecution was their faith in their religion’s laws (which thesis has been attacked by liberal Jews on a daily basis, endangering the very foundation of the Jewish religion; but this is my opinion only, and it is a topic for another discussion). Add “think for yourself” to the mix. Jews have been arguing, interpreting all minute details of religious and other texts, since Moses. Just think of a family dinner at Rosh Hashanah. The discussion, interpretation of, and debate over various text details takes hours and hours. Here is my point: to “have an opinion” to argue a point of view, one must have an independent, thinking mind and strong education to back it up. The entire Jewish culture and religion are about to train Jews from young childhood to “have your own opinion.”

It could be argued that the core of the Jewish existence is based on “obey the law,” and “think for yourself.” Based on this, one would expect that no Jew had gotten near to voting for Hillary R. Clinton in November, 2016. Let us not re-litigate the entire list of undisputable facts with regards to what Ms. Clinton was doing, let us stay with two, no one can debate: she did have an illegal home brew server, and she did have classified information on it. She even admitted that. We now are closing the circle on the same question asked with regards to gun control. How and why a liberal Jew (with 4,000 years worth of roots to “respect the law”) can support a (“any”) person with such a proven, unquestionably unlawful background? Also, how can one rationally claim to be an “independent thinker” (or: a “thinker” at all), and finding cover in the “well, the FBI director said there was no crime” statement at the same time.

Why?

February 08, 2017

If asked, every single Jewish liberal would acknowledge the validity of “populism’s” academic definition: “The central tenet of populism that democracy should reflect the pure and undiluted will of the people”. Yet, liberals in general (which does not bother me), along with liberal Jews (which does) have been practicing the polar opposite of their own beliefs since the Democratic Party lost this election in a landslide. Let me make my case: The United States of America consists of 50 states, where 124,490,696 voters voted on November 8th, 2016. As the popular liberal headline would like us to believe, “Ms. Clinton won the popular vote.” No, she did not. Not by a long shot. Take her positive margin in three (3) states (NY, CA, MA) out of the equation, and she lost the presidential election in forty seven (47) states by 4,431,992 votes. It is an academic question but it must be asked: which –as per the above cited academic definition of “populism”- is the more “popular” in a case of 50 states? What 3 states want or what 47 want? It –again- is not an argument for or against Hillary R. Clinton, it is not even an argument for or against liberalism; it is an attempt to try to correlate the “Jews have been trained to think” cultural, religious and historical background with what the (large) liberal segment of the Jewish population has been portraying in this case.

Another contradiction between 4,000 years worth of Jewish background and what liberal Jews are practicing is portrayed at our universities. As I stated, the Jews, being an unbelievably small (qualifying to the “miniscule” definition) population of the world have been hugely (qualifying to the “overwhelmingly” definition) contributing to the world. Besides the number of Noble Prizes, we have not mentioned fields such as philosophy, religion, classical music, finance, trade, industry and other areas the Noble Prize does not cover. All areas (especially science, innovation, literature, art, music and philosophy) require “the” highest level of independent thinking, a free spirit. Most of these areas are thought to or had significant influence by “higher education,” higher education’s free spirit, free idea exchange; all are a prerequisite of a “thinking human being.” All are the diagonal opposite to “railroaded thinking,” “brain washing” or “being closed minded.” If this thesis is true, then one wonders how liberal Jews can, in any way, shape, matter or form, support the type of brainwashing, almost fascistic level of opinion and views suppression at almost all American universities (the one that happened at Berkley on February 1st)? How can any liberal Jew support not inviting, or even cancelling existing invitations to conservative speakers at these universities? How reports after reports have been coming out from G. Washington, Yale, Columbia, Berkley, USC, University of Texas Austin, Duke, University of Michigan, Cornell, Butler, and Wesleyan? Why liberal Jews have been supporting an ideology, polar opposite to the very tenets that made Jews so successful? Why?

To summarize my core question, why is it that liberal Jewish leaders and liberal Jews in the name of “being liberal” renounce everything that is in their DNA, in their culture and in their 4,000 years worth of religious laws, teachings and studies? That liberal Jews have been violating basic practical, moral and ethical tenets and codes that their very religion dictates? As per a close friend of mine (a conservative Jew with a PhD under his belt): “Because for a liberal Jew, being a liberal is a higher religion than being a Jew.” Although this might have elements of the truth, I don’t believe this is the full explanation. I spent 3,106 words on the topic, and I don’t think I have gotten much closer to decoding this enigma.

Therefore, the question remains open: why??