

INFRAKSHUN

Commentary on The Shadowsphere

Occult Zionism II: The Schizoidal Legacy

I had personally witnessed an ultra-religious Jew refuse to allow his phone to be used on the Sabbath in order to call an ambulance for a non-Jew who happened to have collapsed in his Jerusalem neighbourhood. Instead of simply publishing the incident in the press, I asked for a meeting which is composed of rabbis nominated by the State of Israel. I asked them whether such behavior was consistent with their interpretation of the Jewish religion. They answered that the Jew in question had behaved correctly, indeed piously, and backed their statement by referring me to a passage in an authoritative compendium of Talmudic laws, written in this century.

– Israel Shahak, Jewish History, Jewish Religion The Weight of Three Thousand Years

Political author, activist and polish holocaust survivor Israel Shahak made an enormous contribution to the understanding of Jewish history, politics and culture. In his seminal work *Jewish History, Jewish Religion The Weight of Three Thousand Years* (http://www.amazon.com/Jewish-History-Religion-Thousand-Eastern/dp/0745308198/ref=sr_1_2?ie=UTF8&qid=1428780578&sr=8-2&keywords=Jewish+History%2C+Jewish+Religion+The+Weight+of+Three+Thousand+Years)(1994) he offers an in-depth analysis of the Babylonian Talmud and its influence on orthodox Judaism and politics. In Chapter 5: “The Laws Against Non-Jews.” Shahak places Talmudic discourse into several categories or themes to which he attributes some of the worst disputations in the Halakhah (or “Halacha” – “Jewish Law”) the compendium of the written and Oral Torah and Talmudic and rabbinic law. These include the works by Moses Maimonides (mentioned in the [last post](#) (<https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/2015/04/11/occult-zionism-i/>)) a medieval Spanish, Sephardic Jewish philosopher and astronomer who remains one of the most influential contributors to Torah and Talmudic philosophy and who had a particular distaste for those who didn’t resonate to the Talmud.

The Rabbinical law that is supposed to be a book of religious instruction appears to have an awful lot of instruction on ways to deceive non-Jews. In fact, Shahak’s research is structured on nine categories which only skirt around what are examples of astonishing maleficence directed to those who do not happen to practice Judaism and Talmudic principles.

These are:

1. **Murder and Genocide**
2. **Saving of a life (or not)**
3. **Sexual offences**
4. **Status**
5. **Money and Property**
6. **Gentiles in Israel**
7. **Abuse**

These descriptions offer a perfect example of schizoid psychopathy on show in much of the Halakhah. It is no exaggeration to say that this form is extremely prevalent within the religious authoritarianism of Zionist and Orthodox Judaism. The defining characteristic of this form of pathology is the overriding conviction that its sufferers are the only ones who can deliver and preach the truth. No other person has such “inside knowledge”. This is a product of their own distorted views on reality borne of hypersensitivity and ultra-pessimism. Yet, they believe it is only through their judgement and knowledge that all problems will be ultimately fixed – through agreement with their theoretical rules. Such people have a limited capacity for real emotion and empathy as one would expect, and which is useful for intellectual reasoning aligned to zealotry and fanaticism. Areas of activity which require diplomacy, caring and compassion hold no interest. Their weak self-esteem is buttressed by an unceasing intellectual restlessness and hyperactivity which brooks no interference – they have all the answers, after all.

This perceived intellectual superiority defines their narcissistic sense of power which is usually through the written word or some platform that allows them to formulate theoretical ideas for their audience. The authority of their ideas is vital. And since their concepts and theories are often convoluted and complex, people are bamboozled by their intensity, hyperbole, and austere attention to detail. (*Mein Kampf*, *Communist Manifesto*, *Protocols of Zion*, and *Deuteronomy* come to mind...) What is so dangerous about this form of pathology and with just the sufficient amount of gaps in their awareness – or a similar quota of reciprocal deformations in their own make-up – normal persons project their own ideas and predilections onto the schizoid's pathological material which, if a large cluster of such people are involved, can result in the needed support and energy of “converts”. These individuals do not realise that they have been taken in by something that is quite opposite to what they supposed. Once a person has been overpowered by the sheer tenacity and persistence of their efforts, the effects of their minds become progressively adapted to the pathology of the doctrine with an inability to think critically further induced. What is even more interesting is the presence of schizoid persons who are attracted to religious dogma within Evangelism and Zionist circles. The disconnect is between the apparently “moral” concepts they espouse and the rigid structure of contempt which underlies it.

Zionism and the evolution of Talmudic law were only successful due to the tumultuous times in which ancient people lived. With conflict and trauma, engendered and opportunistic, the laws of the Talmud arose, in spite of and due to its presence in Babylonia, the seat of a legendary decadence and decay – the perfect soil in which Rabbinical law could seed. The schizoid declarations of *Deuteronomy* did their work, feeding off fear and the loss of meaning prevalent at the time. The tactics for filling the vacuum created by war and conflict is easy to do against disenfranchised people. It was the same then as it is today since fear and loss of meaning will always find pathological partners. And the evolution of Judaism – or monotheistic religion in general – is one long story of pathogenic infection.

Andrew Lobaczewski (<https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/2014/02/01/the-psychopath-a-different-species-vii/>), who inaugurated the new discipline of ponerology in his extensive studies of psychopathy, described such individuals at the forefront of propaganda literature. Their view of human nature is so bad that they choose themselves as the only candidates qualified to act as intermediaries for “revolutionary” ideas. Lobaczewski calls this type of expression the “schizoid declaration.” The Talmud

and Old Testament lore is replete with such declarations. Before continuing it might be instructive to include an extract from Lobaczewski's *Political Ponerology* (http://www.amazon.co.uk/Political-Ponerology-Science-Adjusted-Purposes/dp/1897244258/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1428832175&sr=8-1&keywords=political+ponerology) to illustrate the real dangers of a "schizoidally impoverished psychological world-view" and how centuries of Talmudic programming falls precisely into this psychological anomaly:

The quantitative frequency of this anomaly varies among races and nations: low among Blacks, the highest among Jews. Estimates of this frequency range from negligible up to 3 %. In Poland it may be estimated as 0.7 % of population. My observations suggest this anomaly is autosomally hereditary. [...]

In spite of their typical deficits, or even an openly schizoid declaration, their readers do not realize what the authors' characters are like; they interpret such works in a manner corresponding to their own nature. The minds of normal people tend toward corrective interpretation thanks to the participation of their own richer, psychological world-view. However, many readers critically reject such works with moral disgust but without being aware of the specific cause. [...]

[Schizoid individuals] are psychological loners who feel better in some human organization, wherein they become zealots for some ideology, religious bigots, materialists, or adherents of an ideology with satanic features. If their activities consist of direct contact on a small social scale, their acquaintances easily perceive them to be eccentric, which limits their ponerogenic role. However, if they manage to hide their own personality behind the written word, their influence may poison the minds of society in a wide scale and for a long time. [...]

In spite of the fact that the writings of schizoid authors contain the above described deficiency, or even an openly formulated schizoid declaration which constitutes sufficient warning to specialists, the average reader accepts them not as a view of reality warped by this anomaly, but rather as an idea to which he should assume an attitude based on his convictions and his reason. That is the first mistake.

The oversimplified pattern, devoid of psychological color and based on easily available data, exerts an intense influence upon individuals who are insufficiently critical, frequently frustrated as result of downward social adjustment, culturally neglected, or characterized by some psychological deficiencies. Others are provoked to criticism based on their healthy common sense, also they fail to grasp this essential cause of the error...

We can distinguish two distinctly different apperception types among those persons who accept the contents of such works: the critically-corrective and the pathological.

People whose feel for psychological reality is normal tend to incorporate chiefly the more valuable elements of the work. They trivialize the obvious errors and complement the schizoid deficiencies by means of their own richer world-view. This gives rise to a more sensible, measured, and thus creative interpretation, but is not free from the influence of the error frequently adduced above.

Pathological acceptance is manifested by individuals with diverse deviations, whether inherited or acquired, as well as by many people bearing personality malformations or who have been injured by social injustice. [...]

Schizoidia has thus played an essential role as one of the factors in the genesis of the evil threatening our contemporary world. Practicing psychotherapy upon the world will therefore demand that the results of such evil be eliminated as skillfully as possible. [Emphasis mine]

In the context of Judaism and the legacy of the Talmud this is a truly fascinating piece of field study from Lobaczewski, highlighting the importance of critical thinking and psychological hygiene in the face of imposed ideologies, religious or philosophical. In times of economic uncertainty, social unrest and uncertainty this danger becomes heightened. Recall this sentence regarding schizoid propaganda: "...

the average reader accepts them not as a view of reality warped by this anomaly, but rather as an idea to which he should assume an attitude based on his convictions and his reason. That is the first mistake." Can you imagine just how many groups and individuals – having been under the yolk of a materialist and narcissistic culture since their birth and have been molded to accept schizoid programming of our modern day institutions and political ideologies? These are the initial foot-soldiers sent out from essential psychopathy to seed the warped ideas and lay the foundation for Global Pathocracy.

Primed with ponerology and schizoidia in our minds, let's move on to the aforementioned Mr. Shahak and his appraisal of Talmudic programming. (The edited extracts that follow have their original footnotes at the end).

Murder and genocide

"A Jew who murders a Gentile is guilty only of a sin against the laws of Heaven, not punishable by a court. To cause indirectly the death of a Gentile is no sin at all.

Thus, one of the two most important commentators on the Shulhan Arukh explains that when it comes to a Gentile, 'one must not lift one's hand to harm him, but one may harm him indirectly, for instance by removing a ladder after he had fallen into a crevice ... there is no prohibition here, because it was not done directly.'

He points out, however, that an act leading indirectly to a Gentile's death is forbidden if it may cause the spread of hostility towards Jews."

"A Gentile murderer who happens to be under Jewish jurisdiction must be executed whether the victim was Jewish or not. However, if the victim was Gentile and the murderer converts to Judaism, he is not punished."

"... various rabbinical commentators in the past drew the logical conclusion that in wartime all Gentiles belonging to a hostile population may, or even should be killed."

Since 1973 this doctrine is being publicly propagated for the guidance of religious Israeli soldiers. The first such official exhortation was included in a booklet published by the Central Region Command of the Israeli Army, whose area includes the West Bank. In this booklet the Command's Chief Chaplain writes:

"When our forces come across civilians during a war or in hot pursuit or in a raid, so long as there is no certainty that those civilians are incapable of harming our forces, then according to the Halakhah they may and even should be killed... Under no circumstances should an Arab be trusted, even if he makes an impression of being civilized ... In war, when our forces storm the enemy, they are allowed and even enjoined by the Halakhah to kill even good civilians, that is, civilians who are ostensibly good."

"According to the commentators of the Tosafot, a distinction must be made between wartime and peace, so that although during peace time it is forbidden to kill Gentiles, in a case that occurs in wartime it is a mitzvah [imperative, religious duty] to kill them." [5]

Saving a life

"According to the Halakhah, the duty to save the life of a fellow Jew is paramount. ... It supersedes all other religious obligations and interdictions, excepting only the prohibitions against the three most heinous sins of adultery (including incest), murder and idolatry.

As for Gentiles, the basic talmudic principle is that their lives must not be saved, although it is also forbidden to murder them outright. The Talmud itself ...expresses this in the maxim 'Gentiles are neither to be lifted [out of a well] nor hauled down [into it]'. Maimonides ... explains:

'As for Gentiles with whom we are not at war ... their death must not be caused, but it is forbidden to save them if they are at the point of death; if, for example, one of them is seen falling into the sea, he should not be rescued, for it is written: 'neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy fellow' but [a Gentile] is not thy fellow.'" [6]

*"In cases where you must treat a gentile (all non-Jews) then payment must be offered otherwise to do so is against Talmudic law. the Halakhah could have been progressively liberalized. But as a matter of fact the majority of later halakhic authorities, far from extending Rivkes' * leniency to other human groups, have rejected it altogether."* [7]

[* = R. Moses Rivkes, author of a minor commentary on the Shulhan Arukh]

Desecrating the Sabbath to save life

"...certain important rabbinical authorities had to relax the rules to some extent and allowed Jewish doctors to treat Gentiles on the sabbath even if this involved doing certain types of work normally banned on that day. This partial relaxation applied particularly to rich and powerful Gentile patients, who could not be fobbed off so easily and whose hostility could be dangerous." [8]

Sexual offences

"Sexual Intercourse between a married Jewish woman and any man other than her husband is a capital offense for both parties, and one of the three most heinous sins.

The status of Gentile women is very different. The Halakhah presumes all Gentiles to be utterly promiscuous and the verse 'whose flesh is as the flesh of asses, and whose issue [of semen] is like the issue of horses' ... is applied to them.

Whether a Gentile woman is married or not makes no difference, since as far as Jews are concerned the very concept of matrimony does not apply to Gentiles ('There is no matrimony for a heathen'). Therefore, the concept of adultery also does not apply to intercourse between a Jewish man and a Gentile woman; rather, the Talmud equates such intercourse to the sin of bestiality. (For the same reason, Gentiles are generally presumed not to have certain paternity.)"

"...the main punishment is inflicted on the Gentile woman; she must be executed, even if she was raped by the Jew: '

If a Jew has coitus with a Gentile woman, whether she be a child of three or an adult, whether married or unmarried, and even if he is a minor aged only nine years and one day – because he had willful coitus with her, she must be killed, as is the case with a beast, because through her a Jew got into trouble' ...

The Jew, however, must be flogged, and if he is a Kohen (member of the priestly tribe) he must receive double the number of lashes, because he has committed a double offense: a Kohen must not have intercourse with a prostitute, and all Gentile women are presumed to be prostitutes." [9]

Status

"According to the Halakhah, Jews must not (if they can help it) allow a Gentile to be appointed to any position of authority, however small, over Jews. ... Significantly, this particular rule applies also to converts to Judaism and to their descendants (through the female line) for ten generations or 'so long as the descent is known'."

"Gentiles are presumed to be congenital liars, and are disqualified from testifying in a rabbinical court."

"A Jewish woman is nowadays admitted as a witness to certain matters of fact, when the rabbinical court 'believes' her; a Gentile – never."

"... by Jewish religious law, a woman can be declared a widow – and hence free to re-marry – only if the death of her husband is proven with certainty by means of a witness who saw him die or identified his corpse. However, the rabbinical court will accept the hearsay evidence of a Jew who testifies to having heard the fact in question mentioned by a Gentile eyewitness, provided the court is satisfied that the latter was speaking casually (goy mesiah lefi tummo) rather than in reply to a direct question; for a Gentile's direct answer to a Jew's direct question is presumed to be a lie..."^[10]

Money and property

(1) **Gifts** The Talmud bluntly forbids giving a gift to a Gentile. However, classical rabbinical authorities bent this rule because it is customary among businessmen to give gifts to business contacts. It was therefore laid down that a Jew may give a gift to a Gentile acquaintance, since this is regarded not as a true gift but as a sort of investment, for which some return is expected. Gifts to 'unfamiliar Gentiles' remain forbidden. [...]

(2) **Taking of interest.** Anti-Gentile discrimination in this matter has become largely theoretical, in view of the dispensation ... which in effect allows interest to be exacted even from a Jewish borrower. However, it is still the case that granting an interest-free loan to a Jew is recommended as an act of charity, but from a Gentile borrower it is mandatory to exact interest. In fact, many – though not all – rabbinical authorities, including Maimonides, consider it mandatory to exact as much usury as possible on a loan to a Gentile.

(3) **Lost property.** If a Jew finds property whose probable owner is Jewish, the finder is strictly enjoined to make a positive effort to return his find by advertising it publicly. In contrast, the Talmud and all the early rabbinical authorities not only allow a Jewish finder to appropriate an article lost by a Gentile, but actually forbid him or her to return it. [...]

(4) **Deception in business.** It is a grave sin to practice any kind of deception whatsoever against a Jew. Against a Gentile it is only forbidden to practice direct deception. Indirect deception is allowed, unless it is likely to cause hostility towards Jews or insult to the Jewish religion. [...]

(5) **Fraud.** It is forbidden to defraud a Jew by selling or buying at an unreasonable price. However, 'Fraud does not apply to Gentiles, for it is written: "Do not defraud each man his brother"; ... but a Gentile who defrauds a Jew should be compelled to make good the fraud, but should not be punished more severely than a Jew [in a similar case].'

(6) Theft and robbery. *Stealing (without violence) is absolutely forbidden – as the Shulhan 'Arukh so nicely puts it: 'even from a Gentile'. Robbery (with violence) is strictly forbidden if the victim is Jewish. However, robbery of a Gentile by a Jew is not forbidden outright but only under certain circumstances such as 'when the Gentiles are not under our rule', but is permitted 'when they are under our rule'. Rabbinical authorities differ among themselves as to the precise details of the circumstances under which a Jew may rob a Gentile, but the whole debate is concerned only with the relative power of Jews and Gentiles rather than with universal considerations of justice and humanity. This may explain why so very few rabbis have protested against the robbery of Palestinian property in Israel: it was backed by overwhelming Jewish power."* [11]

Gentiles in the land of Israel

"In addition to the general anti-Gentile laws, the Halakhah has special laws against Gentiles who live in the Land of Israel (Eretz Yisra'el) or, in some cases, merely pass through it. These laws are designed to promote Jewish supremacy in that country. The exact geographical definition of the term 'Land of Israel' is much disputed in the Talmud and the talmudic literature, and the debate has continued in modern times between the various shades of Zionist opinion. [...]

"The Halakhah forbids Jews to sell immovable property – fields and houses – in the Land of Israel to Gentiles. In Syria, the sale of houses (but not of fields) is permitted. Leasing a house in the Land of Israel to a Gentile is permitted under two conditions. First, that the house shall not be used for habitation but for other purposes, such as storage. Second, that three or more adjoining houses shall not be so leased." [...]

"It is therefore clear that – exactly as the leaders and sympathizers of Gush Emunim say – the whole question to how the Palestinians ought to be treated is, according to the Halakhah, simply a question of Jewish power: if Jews have sufficient power, then it is their religious duty to expel the Palestinians. All these laws are often quoted by Israeli rabbis and their zealous followers. For example, the law forbidding the lease of three adjoining houses to Gentiles was solemnly quoted by a rabbinical conference held in 1979 to discuss the Camp David treaties. The conference also declared that according to the Halakhah even the 'autonomy' that Begin was ready to offer to the Palestinians is too liberal. Such pronouncements – which do in fact state correctly the position of the Halakhah – are rarely contested by the Zionist 'left'." [12]

Abuse

"In one of the first sections of the daily morning prayer, every devout Jew blesses God for not making him a Gentile." [...]

"The concluding section of the daily prayer ... opens with the statement: 'We must praise the Lord of all ... for not making us like the nations of [all] lands ... for they bow down to vanity and nothingness and pray to a god that does not help.'

"The last clause was censored out of the prayer books. But in Eastern Europe it was supplied orally, and has now been restored into many Israeli-printed prayer books. In the most important section of the weekday prayer – the 'eighteen blessings' – there is a special curse, originally directed against Christians, Jewish converts to Christianity and other Jewish heretics: 'And may the apostates' ... have no hope, and all the Christians perish instantly'. [...]

"Apart from the fixed daily prayers, a devout Jew must utter special short blessings on various occasions, both good and bad ... Some of these occasional prayers serve to inculcate hatred and scorn for all Gentiles, [for example] a pious Jew must utter curse when passing near a Gentile cemetery, whereas he must bless God when passing near a Jewish cemetery ...

"...when seeing a large Jewish population a devout Jew must praise God, while upon seeing a large Gentile population he must utter a curse.

"...the Talmud lays down that a Jew who passes near an inhabited non-Jewish dwelling must ask God to destroy it, whereas if the building is in ruins he must thank the Lord of Vengeance. (Naturally, the rules are reversed for Jewish houses.) This rule was easy to keep for Jewish peasants who lived in their own villages or for small urban communities living in all-Jewish townships or quarters."

"...it became customary to spit (usually three times) upon seeing a church or a crucifix, as an embellishment to the obligatory formula of regret. ... Sometimes insulting biblical verses were also added."

"There is also a series of rules forbidding any expression of praise for Gentiles or for their deeds, except where such praise implies an even greater praise of Jews and things Jewish. This rule is still observed by Orthodox Jews."

"... it is forbidden to join any manifestation of popular Gentile rejoicing, except where failing to join in might cause 'hostility' towards Jews, in which case a 'minimal' show of joy is allowed. In addition to the rules mentioned so far, there are many others whose effect is to inhibit human friendship between ... Jew and Gentile. [...]

"A religious Jew must not drink any wine in whose preparation a Gentile had any part whatsoever. Wine in an open bottle, even if prepared wholly by Jews, becomes banned if a Gentile so much as touches the bottle or passes a hand over it." [...] "...it is permitted to cook food on a holy day for a [Gentile], provided he is not actively encouraged to come and eat."

"An important effect of all these laws – quite apart from their application in practice – is in the attitude created by their constant study which, as part of the study of the Halakhah, is regarded by classical Judaism as a supreme religious duty. Thus an Orthodox Jew learns from his earliest youth, as part of his sacred studies, that Gentiles are compared to dogs, that it is a sin to praise them," [...]

*"In §322, dealing with the **duty** to keep a Gentile slave enslaved for ever (whereas a Jewish slave must be set free after seven years), the following explanation is given:*

And at the root of this religious obligation [is the fact that] the Jewish people are the best of the human species, created to know their Creator and worship Him, and worthy of having slaves to serve them. And if they will not have slaves of other peoples, they would have to enslave their brothers, who would thus be unable to serve the Lord, blessed be He. Therefore we are commanded to possess those for our service, after they are prepared for this and after idolatry is removed from their speech so that there should not be danger in our houses, ... and this is the intention of the verse 'but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor', ... so that you will not have to enslave your brothers, who are all ready to worship God.

In §545, dealing with the religious obligation to exact interest on money lent to Gentiles, the law is stated as follows: 'That we are commanded to demand interest from Gentiles when we lend money to them, and we must not lend to them without interest,' The explanation is:

"And at the root of this religious obligation is that we should not do any act of mercy except to the people who know God and worship Him; and when we refrain from doing merciful ... deed to the rest of mankind and do so only to the former, we are being tested that the main part of love and mercy to them is because they follow the religion of God, blessed be He. Behold, with this intention our reward [from God] when we withhold mercy from the others is equal to that for doing [merciful deeds] to members of our own people. Similar distinctions are made in numerous other passages. The ban against following Gentile customs (§262) means that Jews must not only 'remove themselves' from Gentiles, but also 'speak ill of all their behavior, even of their dress'." [13]

As an addition to Shahak's summary of abuse, Rabbinical law also permits recurrent attempts to either mollify or encourage child abuse. Rather than the best that the Christian Bible has to offer, its replacement is buffered by obscure mystical overtures which nevertheless seep through into the crude and direct echoes of Babylonian black magick. This has obviously been covered up for decades by religious authorities and the Jewish "stockade."

In developmental psychology age nine is about the time when children begin to gain a sense of self or when the personality starts to assert itself. It is especially troubling then to discover that nine-year old boys come under lengthy discussion as to the ideal age of sexual relations with child molestation seen as an "insignificant act" throughout the Talmud. One might say that this is an archaic left-over of a primitive barbarism. But tragically, as we know by now, this is a standard playground for the Establishment rooted in religio-occult justifications as cover for simple psychopathic predation. When such a foundation is the source of a highly influential faction of our present homicidal overseers then we need to take it very seriously indeed.

If a Jew is tempted to do evil, he should put on dirty clothes and go to a city where he is not known, and do the evil there. (BT Moed Kattan 17a)

As we continue our look at the Babylonian Talmud this is not to denigrate the average Jewish man or woman, (though undoubtedly some will take it that way) it is to highlight the nature of the Talmud and Judaism in the context of the chaos which has continued to unfold in the world, expressly encouraged by those within the Zionist Establishment, many of whom are of Kharzarian origins and not even Jews as commonly defined.

After looking at Israel Shahak's analysis of less well known instructions within the Talmud, he did not delve as deeply as Michael Hoffman in weeding out controversies. Shahak's work may be more refined and readable yet, in *Judaism Discovered* which is well over 900 pages in total, there is a wealth of research

that prides open the Talmud's secrets and they are not pleasant to behold, the encouragement of child abuse being one:

"... intercourse with a boy under nine years old is not considered a significant sexual act..." (BT Ketubot 11b)

"... a child less than nine years old cannot...be the object of sodomy" (even if he has been sodomized) (BT Sanhedrin 54b)

This Baraita supports Rav, for it teaches that if a man engaged in homosexual intercourse with a child under the age of nine, he is exempt from liability.

https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/image_thumb1.png (BT Sanhedrin 54b)

From the homosexual abuse of children, we go to a recurrent theme of women who are seen as mere chattel and associated with witchcraft. This is not unusual for its day, however sexual exploitation extends from women to little girls, the abuse of which is similarly permitted under the ancient laws of Orthodox Judaism:

- The birth of a girl is a sad occurrence. (BT Baba Bathra 16b).
- Women are a "vain treasure" to their fathers. (BT Sanhedrin 110b).
- A Jewish male is obligated to say the following prayer every day: "Thank you God for not making me a gentile, a woman or a slave." (BT Menahoth 43b-44a). 418
- "If two women sit at a crossroads, one on this side and the other on the other side, and they face one another, they are certainly witches." (BT Pesachim 111a).
- A woman who had intercourse with a beast is eligible to marry a Jewish priest. A woman who has sex with a demon is also eligible to marry a Jewish priest. (BT Yebamoth 59b).
- It is not good to talk to women, not even your own wife. (BT Aboth).
- Women are lightheaded. (BT Kiddushin 80b).
- Walking behind a woman on the road is sinful. (BT Erubin 18b).
- It is forbidden to teach the Law to a woman. (BT Kiddushin 29b).
- It is permissible to divorce your wife if she burns your dinner, or if you see a prettier girl. (BT Gittin 91a). 419
- Deafness is caused by couples talking during sexual intercourse. (BT Nedarim 20a).
- Jews are commanded by Rabbinic Law to have sexual intercourse only in If these are the requirements for women and girls one shudders to think what protocols are afforded to Gentile women: the dark. (BT Shabbath 86a). ^[14]

In the eyes of these Talmudic lawyers women are "sack[s] of excrement" (BT Shabbat 152b) and lesser beings only to serve Jehovah's will in propagating his chosen people. If these are the requirements for women and girls one shudders to think what protocols are afforded to Gentile women. It doesn't take too long to find out: "The best of the gentiles: kill him; the best of snakes: smash its skull; the best of women: is filled with witchcraft." (Kiddushin 66c)

Sex, magick and sexual abuse appear to be synonymous, numerous definitions of the correct type of sexual intercourse can be found in the Halakah. With the most incredible display of psychopathic paralogic, it is deemed quite normal for girls below the three to be used as playthings since they are not sexually mature so it is therefore deemed permissible:

If a girl is less than three years old, it is permitted to be secluded with her. Likewise, if a boy is less than nine years old a woman is permitted to be alone with him.” — Kitzur Shulchan Aruch: Classic guide to Jewish Law (Metsudah Publications, 1996), v. 2, p. 1023

“If a grown-up man has intercourse with a little girl, it is nothing, for having intercourse with a girl less than three years old is like putting a finger in the eye.” (BT Ketubot 11b)

From Jane Rachel Litman’s 2001 article “Working with Words of Torah” submitted to the *S’hma: A Journal of Jewish Ideas* the ancient Rabbis’ veneration creates some cognitive dissonance when students and teachers alike are confronted with such examples:

“The background sound in the small library is muted but intense. Pairs of scholars lean over their texts whispering energetically, trying to puzzle out the meaning of the particular sugya, passage. The teacher directs them back toward the group and asks for questions.

One student raises a hand: ‘I don’t understand verse 5:4 of the tractate Niddah. What does the phrase ‘it is like a finger in eye’ mean?’

The teacher responds, ‘This refers to the hymen of a girl younger than three years old. The Sages believed that in the case of toddler rape, the hymen would fully grow back by the time the girl reached adulthood and married. Therefore, though violated, she would still technically be counted as a virgin and could marry a priest. It’s an analogy: poling your finger in the eye is uncomfortable, but causes no lasting harm. There is a collective gasp of breath among students. Their dismay is palpable.

They do not like this particular text or the men behind it. But its authors, the rabbis, hardly wrote it with this particular group of students in mind – mostly thirty- and forty-year old women in suburban Philadelphia taking a four-week class titled ‘Women in Jewish Law’ at their Reform synagogue. The questioner persists. ‘I don’t understand. Are you saying this refers to the rape of a three year-old girl?’

“Or younger,’ the teacher responds dryly.

‘I don’t see how it says anything about rape and hymens. You must be mistaken. I don’t believe the rabbis are talking about rape at all. I think this statement has nothing to do with the rest of the passage.’

The teacher (I’ll admit now that it was me, a second-year rabbinic student) responds, ‘Well, that’s the common understanding. What do you think it means?’

The woman is clearly agitated, ‘I don’t know, but I do know that it couldn’t be about child rape.’ This is week three of the class. The woman does not return for week four. Denial.”^[15]

Litman eloquently describes this “denial” in terms of placing it all in perspective. She correctly believes that there is both wisdom and humour in the Torah and Talmud because human beings are fallible. But then she goes onto replay the exact same denial of what are obviously degenerate acts. She believes it is surely natural that we must not throw the baby out with the bath-water when approaching revered sacred Jewish texts which “... are violent or xenophobic, that speak of child abuse, human slavery, or homophobia with gross insensitivity.”

This is not about “gross insensitivity”; it is surely concerned with facing the reality that a religious instruction manual on living your life from so-called “spiritual” men are actively condoning and encouraging child abuse. (You can see one result of these archaic instructions in [The Z Factor XI: Chabad Networks](https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/2014/04/07/the-z-factor-xi-chabad-networks-2/) (<https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/2014/04/07/the-z-factor-xi-chabad-networks-2/>)). This is not a question of ordinary people speaking of such things in a brusque manner and glossing over crimes. This

is about Rabbis setting themselves up as intermediaries of sacred texts and *teaching* those crimes as somehow a normal. Apparently incorporating elements of a “secret” oral Torah, the Talmud has been described as “... an immense superstructure of *precedents*” [16] and “precedents” in Judaism is literally: “instruction.” So, we can safely say that the Talmud is a vast book on “how to ...” according to Rabbinical law. How then, does this square with the the sacred and profane; when sexual pathology is indelibly part of the very foundation of Judaism and bound up with a history of bloody conquest on behalf of Yahweh? (The very same God who likes to lob off babies foreskins).

That is not to say that Christianity and Islam do not suffer from the same symptoms of ponerisation where the original perennial truths were masked and omitted by religious oligarchs. Yet, there appears to be no such masking here other than a careful sanitisation over the centuries. There is an explicit difference sourced from the Talmud and Jewish theology as a whole, where such aberrations have a centuries old tradition in the guise of Occult Zionism and its modern Mossad contractor as one of the most powerful arms of the Establishment today.

As Jesus discovered, the *schizoid* (<https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/2015/04/12/occult-zionism-ii/>) propaganda of the Levites still holds sway. “Taking the good with the bad” is only possible if we are thoroughly sure that we know which is which. Being faced with “human nastiness” only leads to the transformative, “constructive change” of which Litman cites if we know we have been truly objective about what we have embraced. Otherwise, it is just another type of rationalisation which Litman claims to be calling out. Her get-out clause in the face of this dissonance is “equanimity in [her] response.” It is precisely this preference to psychological stability and composure that has led us all into a state of wilful blindness which has encouraged Zionists, international banks and the Catholic Church to get away with indulging their emotional, sexual and financial abuse. And they are allowed to do so because the very foundations of our belief systems have been created so that such impunity is institutionalised.

Though Judaism believes it has THE truth and separates itself from other religions, most of which respect that there are many paths to truth at their core, Judaism and its Talmudic foundation is singularly different. Believing that any text is “God’s Word” is an absolutist heaven for such “equanimity” and invites all the pathological distortions we have been exploring.



(https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/samuel_hirszenberg_szkoc582a_talmudystc3b3w.jpg).

Samuel Hirszenberg, *Talmudic School*, c. 1895-1908. (wikipedia)

The Talmud is awash with minute attention to bodily functions, and an underlying currents of repression, perversity and prurience, the results of which can only result in sexual pathology. What of the mandatory rules for young Jewish boys having already passed through the infant trauma of circumcision, guaranteed to affect their sensitive psycho-emotional development, you then have a multitude of regulations restricting any kind of natural sexual functioning, where a joyful sexual identity cannot be allowed to grow unless it is through hateful masochistic and misogynist means. It effectively sets the child up for neuroses and unhealthy preoccupations which may crystallise in later life.

Michael Hoffman's research offers an example of this neuroses:

"The laws of Orthodox cohabitation demand (that)...(a) man must never see his wife undressed. So when they actually arrive in bed, the idea is to keep her covered by the sheet at all times. However, since propagation is essential, and decreed by law, there's a hole at the appropriate place so that the commandments can be fulfilled... They don't know how to please a woman, how to understand what she wants, how to listen to what she is saying. Sex is simply a right for them, a way of creating more sons. If they follow the laws, they fulfill their sexual duties in the dark, thinking religious thoughts and never speak to their wives about their feelings..."

"One is forbidden to have sex in lamplight unless one makes a partition to block the light from illuminating the body directly. It is prohibited to have sex in the daylight unless the room is darkened with a shade. 883 Sex at the beginning and the end of the night is also forbidden."^[17]

This is not extreme modesty since other exhortations include eroticism and sexual obsession which is enough to make anyone dizzy with confusion. Imagine how this affects a child?

For example, BT Baba Kamma 27a sets up a situation in which a Judaic man falls from the top of a roof and in the course of his fall accidentally inserts his penis inside a woman passerby upon whom he falls! This precipitates a tedious legal analysis of who is liable for what damages. It's a spin on the classic dirty joke motif, only this is from Judaism's holiest book. When Prof. Graydon Snyder of the Chicago Theological Seminary related this Talmud passage to his class, a complaint of sexual harassment was brought against him by a female student.

"Professor Snyder said the woman in his class told him that the story from the Talmud, and his selection of it, conveyed the message that it was permissible to harm women as long as it was unwitting."

"Unwitting" homosexual intercourse is also mitigated in Judaism by its "accidental" nature. Then there's the Midrash on Genesis that holds that Abel was quarreling with Cain over which brother would have Eve sexually, although in the rabbinic mind by this time Lilith was synonymous with Eve, so they were arguing over who would have coitus with Lilith."^[18]

Then there are various amusing descriptions of auto-erotic porn dressed up as mysticism which include "Nebuchadnezzar's Prodigious Member" and tales of his serial sodomy:

"When that wicked man (Nebuchadnezzar) wished to treat that righteous one (Zedekiah) thus (i.e. submit him to sexual abuse), his membrum was extended three hundred cubits and wagged in front of the whole company (of captive kings), for it is said, Thou art filled with shame for glory: drink thou also, and be as one uncircumcised (he'orel): the numerical value of 'orel is three hundred."^[19]

There are many more such passages. It would actually be darkly amusing if these instructions were not taken so seriously and had such a profound impact on the development of civilisations. Now place this in context with our 21st Century sexual abuse epidemic which is currently being exposed. It's source comes from the Establishment, staining society from the top down.

The legacy of Freud and psychoanalysis provided undoubted innovations into the workings of the unconscious and our instinctive drives. Freud is also a product of Jewish culture and thereby Talmudic programming. No where is it clearer than in the instructions and dictums of the Talmud. This clears up a lot of the reasons why Freud's cult of psychoanalysis made such errors in focusing predominantly on sexual neuroses as the cause of all our maladies. These diagnoses were largely predicated on Jewish case studies who in turn, were the result of the same Talmudic programming.

As a left-over of totalitarian Levite law passed on to generations of Rabbis, who in turn conditioned their brethren, it was also applied to non-Jews who had no such inculcation. It therefore muddled the waters terribly for those who were not shackled by such religious indoctrination passing for science. Instead whole generations were subjected to a panoply of diagnostic caricatures with an overemphasis on sex within dreams, an obsessive hunt for latent incest, penis-envy and Oedipal complexes which were not necessarily part of the possibility of a collective genetic inheritance. Suppression of "primitive instincts" were only a part of the overall picture, as contemporary psychology has discovered.

What might science have discovered if it had not been held back?

Other psychotherapeutic modalities may have balanced the influence of psychoanalysis by offering more comprehensive insights into the adaptive unconscious. The wholly subjective nature of interpretation within which Freud promoted served as a further stockade, feeding the already conditioned neuroses in Rabbinical teachings and Jewish culture. Instead of adopting a more holistic and objective appraisals of mental illness, the Freudian pact with the Talmud was applied to everyone.

"When urinating it is forbidden to hold the penis even to facilitate urination. If you are married and your wife is halachically clean [not menstruating], it is permitted to hold your penis [when urinating]. When not urinating it is forbidden to hold his penis."

(Kitzur Shulchan Aruch II:151)

"It is forbidden to look at your wife's genital area." ... "Any [husband] who does look there is devoid of shame."

(Kitzur Shulchan Aruch II:150). [3]

"It is forbidden to bring on an erection in vain, or to cause yourself to think about women. You should be extremely careful to avoid an erection. Therefore, it is forbidden to sleep on your back facing upward or to sleep (on your stomach) facing downward. To avoid an erection you should keep on our side."

Kitzur Shulchan Aruch II:151.

Psychoanalytical discourse was emboldened by behaviourism, the largely Jewish Cultural Marxism, the rise of "scientific technique" and the subsequent Rockefeller-Kinsey (<https://infrakshun.wordpress.com/2014/02/14/the-sex-establishment-iv-the-kinsey-legacy/>) social programming which laid waste to traditional human values. This is where psychopathy had its way in and the decline of conscience and the erosion of a moral dimension in the life of Western humanity. Perversity was apparently not pathology so it became normalised, with fragmentation, separation and a new narcissism fuelling sexual confusion along side the much vaunted sexual revolution. The social

implications for this new, unlimited expression was encouraged in way that went far beyond healthy experimentation and the reaction to conservative prudishness. Talmudism was clearly aligned to a darker version of sexual magick which was then mainstreamed into society over time. It is now very easy to simply blame it on knee-jerk reactions of conservatives and/or anti-Semitism as an evil reaction against progressive left-liberal values. It is neither, though the former obviously exists. That is the nature of Talmudic conditioning which is used to great effect by Zionists. Stockholm syndrome mixed with innate subservience to Religious authoritarianism ensures compliance.

Shahak emphasises the fact that some of the explanations given by contemporary rabbis for the Halakhah are incorrect. He makes the point that “apologetic ‘scholars of Judaism’” know this and seek to insulate understanding from the outside world, though allowing dissent within the Jewish community. But since the thought police are powerful, Jews who share their disquiet with Gentiles are vilified and all manner of denials are issued. Philanthropy, love, brotherhood and mercy are all brought out as evidence for the sanctity and wisdom of Talmudic literature without mentioning that this applies to *Jews alone*. The author – who surely has enough scholarly and personal experience of his own to make the above analyses – makes further observation regarding this deception of one rule for Jews and quite another for Gentiles. He takes Israel as an example, making the claim that the: “... attitudes of hatred and cruelty to towards all Gentiles are among the majority of Israeli Jews,” latent and disguised. No such social etiquette is evident with Zionists whom, according to Shahak have driven the ultra-right wing religious precepts of the Gush Emunim (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gush_Emunim) movement of the 1960s and 1970s out across the socio-political sphere. This has given justification for assassinations, human rights abuse and a rise in the building of Jewish settlements on Palestinian land.

As economic difficulties increase in Israel this is encouraging a reaction against Netanyahu but not necessarily because there is more resistance against Palestinian oppression, though that is undoubtedly a factor, rather, it is due to ordinary Israelis’ standard of living being affected. Jewish self-interest as a much encouraged tenet of ethnocentric values, continues to inform many Israeli citizens perception of reality just as it does the Zionist drive in politics. In relation to Palestinians, ethics and human rights is an irrelevance for the majority, it seems. Left-wing, seemingly “moderate” Zionists are no different. The only thing that matters is Israel since giving in to even the simplest appeal to humane treatment of Palestinians is perceived as a slippery slope to assimilation and disappearance of the Jewish identity. Survival is the overriding directive which trumps all else.

Notes

[1] pp.123-125; *Political Ponerology – A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes* (2007) By Andrew M. Lobaczewski; Red Pill Press; 2nd edition (April 4, 2007 ISBN-10: 1897244258).

[2] Ibid; pp.75-76 | R. Yo’el Sirkis, Bayit Hadash, commentary on Beyt Josef, yoreh De’ah’ 158. The two rules just mentioned apply even if the Gentile victim is ger toshav, that is a ‘resident alien’ who has undertaken in front of three Jewish witnesses to keep the ‘seven Noahide precepts’ (seven biblical laws considered by the Talmud to be addressed to Gentiles).

[3] Ibid; p.76 | “For example, R. Shabbtay Kohen (mid 17th century), Siftey Kohen on Shulhan ‘Arukh, ‘Yoreh De’ah, 158: ‘But in times of war it was the custom to kill them with one’s own hands, for it is said, “The best of Gentiles – kill him!”’ Siftey Kohen and Turey Zahay ... are the two major classical commentaries on the Shulhan ‘Arukh.”

[4] Ibid. | Colonel Rabbi A. Avidan (Zemel), ‘Tohar hannesheq le’or hahalakhah’ (= ‘Purity of weapons in the light of the Halakhah’) in Be’iqvot milhemet yom hakkippurim – pirqey hagut, halakhah umehqar (In

the Wake of the Yom Kippur War – Chapters of Meditation, Halakhah and Research), Central Region Command, 1973: quoted in Ha'olam Hazzeh, 5 January 1974; also quoted by David Shaham, 'A chapter of meditation', Hotam, 28 March 1974; and by Amnon Rubinstein, 'Who falsifies the Halakhah?' Ma'ariv", 13 October 1975. Rubinstein reports that the booklet was subsequently withdrawn from circulation by order of the Chief of General Staff, presumably because it encouraged soldiers to disobey his own orders; but he complains that Rabbi Avidan has not been court-martialled, nor has any rabbi – military or civil – taken exception to what he had written."

[5] Ibid; p.78.

[6] Ibid. Leviticus, 19:16. Concerning the rendering 'thy fellow' [...]

[7] Ibid.

[8] Ibid; p.82

[9] Ibid; p. 87 | Ezekiel, 23:20. | Tractate Berakhot, p. 78a. | Talmudic Encyclopedia, 'Eshet Ish' ('Married Woman'). | Exodus, 20:17. | 44 Genesis, 2:24. | Maimonides, op. cit., 'Prohibitions on Sexual Intercourse' 12; 10; Talmudic | Encyclopedia, 'Goy'. | Maimonides, op. cit., ibid., 12, 1-3. "As a matter of fact, every Gentile woman is | regarded as N.Sh.G.Z. – acronym for the Hebrew words niddah, shifhah, goyah, zonah (unpurified from menses, slave, Gentile, prostitute). Upon conversion to Judaism, she ceases indeed to be niddah, shifhah, goyah but is still considered zonah (prostitute) for the rest of her life, simply by virtue of having been born of a Gentile mother. In a special category is a woman 'conceived not in holiness but born in holiness', that is born to a mother who had converted to Judaism while pregnant. In order to make quite sure that there are no mix-ups, the rabbis insist that a married couple who convert to Judaism together must abstain from marital relations for three months."

[10] Ibid; p.88 | "Characteristically, an exception to this generalization is made with respect to Gentiles holding legal office relating to financial transactions: notaries, debt collectors, bailiff~ and the like. No similar exception is made regarding ordinary decent Gentiles, not even if they are friendly towards Jews."

[11] Ibid; p.89 | Leviticus, 25:14. This is a literal translation of the Hebrew phrase. The King James Version renders this as 'ye shall not oppress one another'; 'oppress' is imprecise but 'one another' is a correct rendering of the biblical idiom 'each man his brother'. As pointed out in Chapter 3, the Halakhah interprets all such idioms as referring exclusively to one's fellow Jew. | Shulhan 'Arukh, 'Hoshen Mishpat' 227.

[12] Ibid. p.90 | "This view is advocated by H. Bar-Droma, Wezeh Gvul Ha'aretz (And This Is the Border of the Land), Jerusalem, 1958. In recent years this book is much used by the Israeli army in indoctrinating its officers. | Maimonides, op. cit., 'Idolatry' 10, 3-4. | Exodus, 23:33. | Maimonides, op. cit., 'Idolatry' 10, 6.

[13] Ibid; pp.92-96 | "This is followed by a blessing 'for not making me a slave'. Next, a male must add a blessing 'for not making me a woman', and a female 'for making me as He pleased'. | In eastern Europe it was until recent times a universal custom among Jews to spit on the floor at this point, as an expression of scorn. This was not however a strict obligation, and today the custom is kept only by the most pious. | The Hebrew word is meshummadim, which in rabbinical usage refers to Jews who become 'idolators', that is either pagan or Christians, but not to Jewish converts to Islam. | The Hebrew word is minim, whose precise meaning is 'disbelievers in the uniqueness of God'. | Tractate Berakhot, p. 58b. | According to many rabbinical authorities the original rule still applies in full in the Land of Israel. | This custom gave rise to many incidents in the history of European Jewry. One of the most famous, whose consequence is still visible today, occurred in 14th century Prague. King Charles IV of Bohemia (who was also Holy Roman Emperor) had a magnificent crucifix erected in the middle of a stone bridge which he had built and which still exists today. It was then reported to him that the Jews of Prague are in the habit of spitting whenever they pass next to the crucifix. Being a famous protector of the Jews, he did not institute persecution against them, but simply sentenced the Jewish community to pay for the Hebrew word Adonay (Lord) to be inscribed on the crucifix in golden letters. This word is one of the seven holiest names of God, and no mark of disrespect is allowed in front of it. The spitting ceased. Other incidents connected with the same custom were much less amusing. | The verses most commonly used for this

purpose contain words derived from the Hebrew root shaqetz which means 'abominate, detest', as in Deuteronomy, 7:26: 'thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it; for it is a cursed thing.' It seems that the insulting term sheqetz, used to refer to all Gentiles (Chapter 2), originated from this custom. | Talmud, Tractate Beytzah, p. 21a, b; Mishnah Berurah on Shulhan 'Arukh, 'Orah Hayyim' 512. Another commentary (Magen Avraham) also excludes Karaites."

[14] paragraph 2.740; *Judaism Discovered: A Study of the Anti-Biblical Religion of Racism, Self-Worship, Superstition and Deceit* (2008) By Michael Hoffman. (kindle edition)

[15] 'Working With the Words of Torah' April 1, 2001, Jane Rachel Litman

<http://shma.com/2001/04/working-with-the-words-of-torah/> (<http://shma.com/2001/04/working-with-the-words-of-torah/>).

[16] Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, p.112.

[17] op.cit. Hoffman; paragraph 2.1486 | Note: Mishnah Berurah, Laws of Daily Conduct, v. 2, C [202-241] sec. 6

[18] Ibid. paragraph 2.1488 | Note: Conduct, v. 2, C [202-241] sec. 4. Dirk Johnson, "A Sexual Harassment Case to Test Academic Freedom," May 11, 1994

[19] Ibid; paragraph 2.1490 | Note: (op. cit.), pp. 98-99.

Posted in [9/11](#), [Abuse](#), [CoIntelpro](#), [Establishment / Elite](#), [Occult](#), [Psychology](#), [Psychopathy](#), [Religion](#), [Social Engineering](#), [Spirituality / Esoterica](#), [War](#), [Zionism](#) and tagged [Authoritarianism](#), [Babylon](#), [Babylonian Talmud](#), [Black Magick](#), [Child abuse](#), [Christianity](#), [Deuteronomy](#), [Freud](#), [genocide](#), [gentiles](#), [God](#), [Halakhah](#), [Israel](#), [Jehovah](#), [Jerusalem](#), [Jesus Christ](#), [Jewish theocracy](#), [jews](#), [Judah](#), [Judaism](#), [Kabbalah](#), [Levite priests](#), [Lobaczewski](#), [Maimonides](#), [murder](#), [Occult-Zionism](#), [Orthodox Judaism](#), [Pales](#), [Palestine](#), [Palestinians](#), [Pharisees](#), [psychoanalysis](#), [psychopaths](#), [Rabbincal law](#), [Schizoidia](#), [sexual abuse](#), [Shahak](#), [Talmud](#), [The Bible](#), [Torah](#), [Yahweh](#), [Zionists](#) on [April 12, 2015](#) by [M.K. Styllinski](#). [Leave a comment](#)

This site uses Akismet to reduce spam. [Learn how your comment data is processed.](#)

[WEBSITE POWERED BY WORDPRESS.COM.](#)