

Was the Assassination of Yitzhak Rabin a Hoax?

by Josh G



King Hussein of Jordan (left) with Yitzhak Rabin (right)

November 4th marks the 22nd anniversary of the alleged assassination of Yitzhak Rabin. You may recall that Rabin won the Nobel Prize in 1994 for signing the Oslo accords with Yasser Arafat and Shimon Peres. He is still widely remembered as the “soldier of peace” who would have brought an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. . . if only he hadn’t been killed by a right-wing nut-job named Yigal Amir in an attempt to derail the peace process.

The assassination took place at night, just after Rabin had addressed a huge peace rally held to support the Oslo accords in the face of virulent right-wing opposition. After the rally, as Rabin made his way down the steps from the speakers’ platform, Amir approached and shot him from behind. He was brought to a nearby hospital and died on the operating table, despite the doctors’ best efforts. All of this is well known, documented on videotape and firmly established by the Shamgar Commission, which investigated the assassination. It was named after its chairman, Israeli Supreme Court justice Meir Shamgar. Sort of like the Warren commission, except here they mock us by openly advertising that it was a *sham*.

Would it surprise you to learn that there are at least half a dozen conspiracy theories swirling around Rabin’s assassination? It surprised me. When I first heard of them, I didn’t know how to make sense of all the anomalies, contradictions, and impossibilities that these theories lay bare, let alone sift through the plausibility of different claims about who was behind it all. Some of these theories hold that Rabin was killed because he was about to pull the plug on the peace process, and the people behind the plot didn’t want that, for various reasons. It didn’t seem the least bit plausible. I mean, if that was their goal they

seem to have achieved the exact opposite: his murder derailed the peace process, *didn't it?*

I learned of those theories before I had ever heard of Miles Mathis or read his papers on the hoaxed assassinations of [JFK](#) and [Lincoln](#). Thanks to him, now I do know how to make sense of it all, and in this (hopefully) short paper I'm going to explain why I think the Rabin assassination was another hoax. If you are convinced by the end, great. If not, can't blame a guy for trying.

I've actually been wise to this one for a while, but I just didn't feel it was important enough to spend time outing it. What prompted me to write about it now is that I finally got sick and tired of the incessant hero-worship Rabin is treated to every time November 4th comes around. In addition to all the newspaper articles and TV specials around the world devoted to him, nearly every Israeli town, school, kindergarten, daycare center and scout troop has a ceremony in his honor. It's enough to make JFK jealous. I think I would find it nauseating even if I bought into the hype. But I don't and never did. Take the Oslo accords for starters. Any honest person making a sober assessment of that agreement would have to acknowledge [it could never serve as the basis](#) for a viable Palestinian state. Oslo was a PR triumph, to be sure, but nobody truly interested in peace would have signed it, and you'd have to be unbelievably disingenuous to then shake hands with the enemy and humbly accept the Nobel Prize for your "bravery." One thing the agreement did achieve was to relieve Israelis of the burden of the day-to-day governance over most Palestinians in the West Bank, turning that task over to the collaborating kleptocrats who run the Palestinian Authority. In fact, [there is a good argument to be made](#) that the Oslo agreement permanently handicapped future attempts at peace and paved the way for a massive increase in Israeli settlements. But that couldn't have been intentional, right?

Rabin may be honored every year, but in my view he was anything but honorable. For most of his life he was a warmonger who toyed with being a genocidal maniac. As a two-star general and Defense Minister during the first Intifada, he infamously ordered Israeli soldiers to "[break the bones](#)" of Palestinian protesters. He played a leading role in [the ethnic cleansing of Palestinians](#) during the war that won Israel its independence—which I am now fairly certain was another stage-managed psyop along with all of Israel's wars. But making that case will have to wait. Rabin was Chief of Staff of the IDF during the Six Day War, which, all patter and excuses aside, was started by Israel. That one ended with the capture of the Golan Heights, the West Bank, East Jerusalem, the Gaza strip and the Sinai peninsula.


We are told Rabin was willing to make concessions on West Bank settlements in exchange for peace. But if he was *really* interested in peace, why didn't he put a stop to the settlement project when he had the chance? Like, say, when he was Prime Minister in the late 1970s? Or again in the 1990s? It's not like Arafat or the Palestinians would have tried to stop him. But in fact, [he always did his best to build and bolster](#) the settlements. The settlements are like a virus deliberately injected into the landscape in order to kill any hope for peace, and he continued

[to build them at a breakneck pace](#) up until the day he was fake-killed. [Something most people don't realize is that it no matter which party is in power in Israel, the settlement project continues unabated.] We are assured that Rabin had some kind of epiphany and realized he needed to compromise. Either that or [George Bush](#) and [Bill Clinton](#) brought the hammer down on him. I don't think so. Rabin talked a good talk, to be sure. But so did Gandhi, Roosevelt, Debs, Reed, Butler, etc. As we've seen time and again, talk is cheap, and the last thing we should *ever do* is take these bozos at their word. Actions speak louder than words, and if nothing else Rabin's participation in this fake assassination—which ripped the hearts out of millions of Israelis and mercilessly stomped on them—tells us all we need to know about this “hero.”

Well, there I go running off at the mouth again. I promised myself I would keep this short, so let's get down to business, shall we? For fun, let's kick things off with some fake photos, or as I like to call them, [fauxtos](#). Here's a baby picture of Rabin with his mother:



Do I even need to point out what a bad photomontage this is? Notice the darker shadows on her, lighter shadows on him. Also, he has touchlights on his pupils and she doesn't. Here is another awful paste-up of him as a child with his mother and sister:



The one on the left comes from the Rabin foundation website; the one on the right is from the Knesset website. The Knesset picture was altered to try to hide the anomalies, notably the different shading on Rabin's mother and brother compared to him. Notice how the Knesset website has considerably darkened the shadows on his face? But they forgot to do the same to his sister, so you still have a mismatch. **All three heads are in completely different light.** These are the only two pictures I was able to find of him with his mother, and they are both fake. I don't know what they are trying to hide about his real origins, but I can't think of any reason they would try to pass off these fake pictures as real if they weren't trying to hide something.

Then we get this horrible paste-up job of Rabin with his daughter circa 1951:



There are lots of problems here, but I'll just draw your attention to the shadows in the hair and clothes. See how her shadows are much darker in the hair than his? But if we study their clothes, he has dark shadows while she has light shadows. This indicates her head was pasted on that body. Which leads us to study their eyes. Look how the shadows above her eyes are a lot darker than his. Impossible. Also notice her hand. Talk about cheeky!

And finally, here's one allegedly of Rabin with other Israeli representatives to the 1949 Armistice talks with Egypt in Rhodes:



Rabin is on your right. First of all, where are they supposed to be? Top brass studying a map in a room with one chair next to a circular stone wall. With no ceiling. They are lit by the sun, so maybe they are in an open missile silo? But it doesn't matter, since Rabin is obviously pasted in there. Look at the edge of his face to your left, where there is a dark line. Also along the edge of his hair on that side. But all his lines are unnatural. If you can't see that, look at the shadows of the two guys to your left. They are throwing shadows down on the floor, but also back on the wall. Were two suns up that day inside the silo? Rabin does not appear in any of the other published photographs of the armistice talks, which do not look faked, leading me to conclude that Rabin was never actually there. If he was really there, then I'd think they could supply us with an actual picture of him instead of this garbage. I don't know why they felt a need to insert him into the armistice talks. Perhaps they wanted to fatten his resumé.

In 1952, Rabin spent a year at the British Army Staff College in Camberley, [ostensibly in order to](#) "integrate Israel ... into the Western defense establishment" and learn what he could from the British. This is curious indeed, since Rabin had been a leader of the Palmach, which was a special branch of the proto-defense forces of the pre-state Jewish proto-government during the British mandate. From 1920-1948, the area now known as Israel (plus some surrounding regions) were under British rule at the behest of the League of Nations. As you might imagine, the British did not take kindly to a segment of the population raising its own army, especially when said army led many missions and terror attacks against the British (though at this point we should suspect if not assume that this opposition was all manufactured and these attacks hoaxed). So as one of the leaders of an outlawed military organization, Rabin was considered a guerilla and an enemy of the British. We are told he even spent time in jail for his activities. But apparently the British had a short memory, since they welcomed him into their most elite military staff college just a few years later. It would be like the British in 1780 inviting George Washington to study with their top military leaders.

As more proof of my point, I link you to [a list of alumni of this college](#), where we see many familiar names from the peerage like Arbuthnott, Bonham-Carter,

Butler, Foster, Fuller, Green, Kennedy, Milne, Morgan, Parker, Schreiber, etc. If all of this isn't enough to make you think there's something *really* fishy about Rabin, then I don't know what will.

You may be relieved to hear that I don't have much to say about Rabin's genealogy. The man was admittedly Jewish, so there is nothing to out there. We are told his father was from the Ukraine and his mother from Belarus. I found no interesting connections in his publicly posted genealogy, though I did find some more fake pictures. His wife is a bit more interesting. We're told she comes from an upper-middle-class family, which in spook code means she was filthy rich. Her maiden name is Schlossberg. Recall that the name Schlossberg(er) came up in Miles's paper on [Nathaniel Hawthorne](#), where he also reminded us that JFK's only grandchildren are Schlossbergs, since Caroline Kennedy married a Schlossberg. Are they related to Rabin's wife? It's hard to say since the genealogies don't go back very far. But it wouldn't surprise me.

[Miles: also worth knowing: Rabin's mother was a **Cohen**. She founded the agricultural school at kibbutz Givat HaShlosa. Rabin was also a **Goldberg**, a **Schlesinger** and a **Finkelstein**, and they were from Prussia. While there they married with the **Loebs** and **Schiffs**. A bit further back, and we find he was [also a HaLevi and a Marx!](#) On the paternal side, Rabin's father was actually a Rubitzow, which ties us to the Rubinsteins/Rubys we just saw in my paper on Jack Ruby. As for Rabin's wife Leah Schlossberg, all the women on her maternal side are scrubbed, indicating some major action there being suppressed.]

Okay, now that we're all nice and warmed up, let's get on to the assassination. The details of the event have been picked over by Israeli conspiracy theorists, and they've made my job here really easy. There is even a [Wikipedia page](#) in English on the conspiracy theories. As you'd expect, in every version of the conspiracy theory Rabin is dead and somebody killed him. But what's surprising about this is that almost every conspiracy theory about this event demonstrates quite convincingly that Yigal Amir *did not kill Rabin*. This isn't one of those "Oswald wasn't the only shooter" scenarios. This is a "he fired blanks and Rabin was not shot on the scene" scenario. I'll hit the highlights, but if you want more, [this is as good a place to start](#) as any and was my first exposure to the Rabin conspiracy theories. [Here is a much longer read](#). (Note that last link is one of two English-language conspiracy books written about the assassination. It was written by an American immigrant to Israel named David **Morrison**. His first wife was Jo Ann **Hess**. If you don't know why that's significant, read Miles's [paper on Hitler](#) and the top Nazis, including Rudolph Hess. You can also read his paper on Jim Morrison.) The other book was written by Barry Chamish, about whom I'll have more to say below.

To begin with, the assassination was [caught on video](#) by someone who implausibly happened to be in just the right place at just the right time. We are told that this "someone" was Roni Kempler, an accountant with the State Comptroller. Note the last name. It is only one letter away from Kemper, which came up in [Miles's recent paper on Ed Kemper](#). To get a sense of how absurd

this part of the story is, take a look at this image of the spot where Rabin was allegedly gunned down:



The building on the left is Tel Aviv City Hall. Under that building, center left of the picture, there is a small group of people standing around next to the memorial erected on the spot where Rabin was allegedly shot (just in front of the 3 Israeli flags). Behind them, you can see stairs coming down from the platform or terrace above. Those are the stairs Rabin came down just before he was shot. He had just finished giving a speech from the terrace to the crowd gathered on the large plaza that is out of frame around the corner *to the left of City Hall*. Kempler started filming this view from the street, but then moved to the roof of the single-story building on the right, after police apparently asked him to leave.

The first question we should ask is: why was he filming here in the first place? The building completely blocked the rally itself, so he could not have seen or recorded any of it from here. Wikipedia tells us that Kempler was “an amateur photographer that frequently filmed events with his handheld video camera looking for special angles.” Did he also frequently film events from locations that *made it impossible to actually film those events*? Or are they giving us a hint here that the event he actually wanted to film is the assassination? This story reminds me of “amateur sports photographer” [Ben Thorndike](#), who just happened to be in the right place at the right time with camera at the ready to snap those infamous pics of the crisis actors getting into position just after the first bomb went off at the Boston Marathon. But unlike Ben, who said the camera belonged to him, Kempler said he didn’t actually own a video camera and had borrowed it from someone, though we don’t know who. I guess he frequently borrowed it for his frequent filming of events.

Kempler was not alone on the roof, as there were several Secret Service agents¹ on the lookout. Of course that rooftop was a very strategic location for anyone wishing to do harm to the VIP's giving speeches that night, and it stretches credulity to the breaking point to think that they would allow someone random guy up there to stand around filming. They didn't want him down on the street, but it was OK for him to be up on this rooftop? Adding to people's suspicions about the video is that, if you watch the whole thing, you can see that Kempler trains the camera on Yigal Amir several times well before the shooting. But Amir was just sitting there, not really doing anything, so there is no reason why he would do that. In the only interview Kempler gave to the press after he went forward with his footage a month or two after the event, he explains this anomaly by saying that it crossed his mind that, if someone were going to assassinate Rabin or another politician, this would be the place to do it. He thought that something about Amir seemed off and that if anyone there would be the assassin, it would be him. I guess his account is supposed to give us goosebumps or something. But bullshit like that only makes my skin crawl. There are many other anomalies and red flags with Kempler and his video that I won't go into. For my part, I don't believe Kempler was ever up on that rooftop. He was just the public face to give the story whatever plausibility it presumably had.

Now that you have some familiarity with the setting, take a moment to watch in slow motion [the key moment in the video](#) where Amir steps forward and (allegedly) shoots Rabin. The video has been analyzed *ad nauseum*. Like the Zapruder film, the Kempler film has been shown to have been edited and altered. Just to give one example, by all accounts (including by the shooter himself), Amir held the gun in his right hand, but in the video he is holding it in his left. You can also see that, although allegedly shot in the chest with a hollow-point round, Rabin doesn't even flinch after the first shot. He actually continues walking and turns his head to look behind him, all of which would have been an extremely unlikely scenario if it had hit him in the chest as the official story has it.

Many eyewitnesses report hearing police and body guards shouting during the shooting that the shots were "blanks" or "not real." Others, including police and bodyguards, said they sounded like party poppers or in any case not like regular

¹ The "secret service" in Israel is sometimes called Shin Bet (the first two Hebrew letters of the agency's name) or by its Hebrew acronym, SHaBaK (Sherut Bitachon Klalit). The direct translation into English is "General Security Service" but their official English name is the Israeli Security Agency. It is sort of akin to the secret service and the FBI rolled into one with a heaping spoonful of extra spookiness. [Wikipedia](#) describes it as "one of three principal organizations of the Israeli intelligence community, alongside Aman (military intelligence) and the Mossad (foreign intelligence service)." Its duties include "safeguarding state security, exposing terrorist rings, interrogating terror suspects, providing intelligence for counter-terrorism operations in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, counter-espionage, personal protection of senior public officials, securing important infrastructure and government buildings, and safeguarding Israeli airlines and overseas embassies." Although these are all officially separate agencies, the lines are much blurrier in reality, just like with the FBI, the CIA, and military intelligence.

bullets. One witness who [says she was near Rabin when Amir opened fire](#) was emphatic that Rabin had not been hurt at all and continued walking a short distance to his car. Rabin's wife later wrote in her book about the assassination that Rabin looked fine before his bodyguards tackled him following the first shot. She also said that she repeatedly asked the bodyguards what had happened and they kept telling her it wasn't real. Many security or police personnel reported having seen no indication that Rabin was hurt. There were also no bloodstains on the ground at the scene of the shooting despite him having been allegedly shot by 9mm hollow point bullets in the lung and spleen. There was also no gunpowder residue found on Amir's hands, clothes or hair, which would have been impossible unless he fired blanks.

This is a small taste of the anomalies surrounding this assassination, which stack to the heavens, and all the evidence overwhelmingly points to the conclusion that Amir never shot Rabin. *It was a hoax.* So then why do all the conspiracy theorists who unearthed all this evidence and insist that Yigal fired blanks nevertheless believe that Rabin was actually killed? Well here's where the misdirection takes off. You see, they want us to believe the "real" shooting happened *after* Rabin got into his car.

The Kempler video is used as one piece of evidence for this. In the Shamgar commission report, nobody else was in the back of the limousine where they put Rabin after the fake shooting. But on the video, you can clearly see the rear door on the opposite side closing from the inside. Although they have tried to explain away this anomaly, saying for example that vibrations caused the door to close, these explanations don't hold up to the slightest skepticism. There was almost certainly someone on the inside. Mainstream conspiracy theorists want you to believe it was the real killer. They also point to the time it took to get Rabin to the hospital: a trip that should have taken a minute tops took at least eight, and in some versions as much as 22. Additional evidence comes from a police forensics examiner who testified that one of the shots was fired from about 20cm away and the other one point-blank (muzzle touching the body). But in the video Amir clearly never got that close.

Conspiracy theorists also point to discrepancies in the medical reports and other evidence to argue that Rabin was shot in the car on the way to the hospital, or by some accounts the *coup de grâce* was actually delivered at the hospital. I'm not going to take you through all the ins and outs of all the minute details, but here is a good example of these inconsistencies, taken from Barry Chamish's [Who Murdered Yitzhak Rabin?](#) According to an announcement by the Minister of Health during live news coverage the night of the assassination, Rabin took three bullets: one in the chest, one in the stomach, and one in the spine. The head of the hospital announced on the news live that evening and wrote in his handwritten report from the surgery, that Rabin had received two gunshot wounds, including one that shattered his spinal cord. The handwritten notes from that night written by the senior surgeon who oversaw the treatment of Rabin also indicated two bullets, one of which shattered his spinal cord. Of course if that

was the case, there is no way he could have continued walking after he was shot. He would have dropped like a rock. This is taken as evidence that he *must* have been shot in the front of the chest later on. Added to this is the appearance of a deliberate cover-up: the final medical report, the coroner's report and the Shamgar commission say that Rabin was shot twice through the back, neither hitting his spinal cord. (The coroner in question was Yehuda Hiss—awfully close to Hess—who has been [at the center of many controversies](#) over the years.) In addition, a forensics specialist with the police testified that his examination of Rabin's clothes showed the existence of only two bullets. So how to reconcile these discrepant accounts? Chamish concludes that Rabin must have been shot the third time when he wasn't wearing any clothes—that is, when he was in the hospital. Here is what he calls the “most likely” scenario, with my commentary in brackets:

Rabin arrived alive at the hospital. He took two point-blank shots in the back during the car ride to Ichilov and somehow survived them. When the doctors revived him, the conspirators panicked and used one of their guns to finish him off with a bullet through the chest which shattered his spine. [Except that he takes the senior surgeon's handwritten report as credible, and in that report the doctor said there were only 2 gunshot wounds, one of which shattered the spine. He has no way to explain this, nor does he bother.]

It was at this point that the cover-up began. The conspirators realized the fatal flaw in the final shot. Rabin wasn't wearing his clothes and there was no hole in the front of his suit or shirt.... There was no believable way to add a third shot to the clothes or their contents. [What, they couldn't just shoot a hole through them?]

Instead, they threatened the doctors and staff to lie. One can only imagine the brutal threats. We had a hint of them in May 1995 when the news magazine Zman Tel Aviv reported that everyone on duty at Ichilov saving Rabin, seventeen people, received anonymous death threats by mail. The first to be threatened that night was the pathologist and taxi passenger Dr. Hiss. By 1 AM, he got rid of the truthful conclusions of Drs. Gutman, Sneh and Barabash and invented a whole new story deleting the chest and spinal wounds. [Except, again, Dr. Gutman said there were only two wounds; was he telling the truth?] And from that point on, the cover up continued. Murder threats from people who have nothing to lose can keep a lot of people quiet, even and especially cabinet ministers.

As usual, the mainstream conspiracy theories are themselves full of contradictions and minute details that somehow always manage to keep the reader confused and searching in vain for a consistent story. Chamish can't even keep all the details straight to produce a coherent narrative. He even writes later, “I had to admit, the assassination was too complicated to be solved completely and new information just wouldn't stop coming in.”

And like all mainstream conspiracy theories about assassinations, they never question whether the person actually died, even in this case when they're showing you his assassination was a hoax. Chamish's book even starts off his book with a statement in bold on an otherwise blank page just inside the cover: "Yitzhak Rabin was murdered on November 4, 1995." Yes, well, now that we've got that part nailed down, let's figure out who dunnit. His death was never open to question, nor did he want his readers to ever question it.

But we need to ask: if the "real" details of his murder could be covered up, couldn't they cover up Rabin being alive? If the medical staff could be threatened into keeping secret the "real" reasons for his death, then couldn't they be threatened into keeping secret a faked death? If the medical records could be changed to fit the official story, then couldn't they have been completely fabricated from the start? Yes, yes, and yes. You see, they want us to believe that there were "real" reports that were later changed as part of a cover up. But they never question the assumption that the original reports were real in the first place. I am reminded here of the "secret file" they used to convict [Alfred Dreyfus](#). Some decades after the trial, the documents in the secret file were finally released. Only much later did a pair of historians show that most of those documents had been fabricated/forged, with many having been added to the file after the initial trial. They assume that some of those documents were real in the first place. But *some* of the documents could be manufactured and inserted into the official record, then *all* of the documents could be. Same thing here.

The Kempler video can now be seen in a different light. The mainstream conspiracy theorists suspect that Kempler's video was filmed on purpose to be used as evidence that Amir was the 'real killer.' They want us to believe that the Kempler video was doctored to this end. And yet many anomalies between the video and the official account remain and are seized on as evidence that Amir was not the killer. They make the hoax so obvious. So I guess we're supposed to believe that whoever was in charge didn't do a very good job. But I think they're only partly right. I think many if not all of the discrepancies were planned and planted in advance, including the other door being closed by someone else inside the car. In other words, the Kempler video was also deliberately made to feed these conspiracy theories.

[Miles: But why not just stage one clean and tight hoax in the first place? Why create a mainstream theory AND an alternative theory from the get-go? Because. . . it has been found that two or more stories cover a fake better than one. This wasn't their first rodeo. This was long after the Lincoln and Kennedy fakes, so they figured out long ago that it helps to plant secondary theories for those who don't bite on the primary theory. A whole lot of competing theories keep researchers from asking if the event happened at all.]

To see this you have to understand the purpose this psy-op. Of course one goal was, as Miles wrote about JFK, to keep the populace in permanent trauma. Another was to deepen the already deep divides between certain parts of Israeli

society. Some of you may imagine Israel as a unified boot stamping on a Palestinian face – forever. But Israel is a country that is deeply divided along many overlapping and intersecting lines. Of course the Jewish-Palestinian divide is the clearest and deepest and bootiest, but another huge one exists between the secular and the religious, and within that a divide between the mainstream secular “left” and the national religious “right”—with most settlers belonging to this latter group, along with others such as supporters of Bennet’s Jewish Home party and much of Netanyahu’s Likud. (I put quotation marks around left and right because those are relative terms; even the mainstream left in Israel is pretty far to the right; the Likud is now considered a centrist position.) The official version of the assassination plays on this divide by adding to the disgust and hatred that the mainstream has for the national religious block.² But the mainstream conspiracy theories go one step further by deepening the hatred and distrust that the national religious block has for the secular left/mainstream and the government itself.

You see, in these theories the SHABAK plays a leading role as villain. It turns out that Yigal Amir was an active member of a right-wing radical group called Eyal. The leader of that group was a guy named Avishai Raviv, and in the wake of the assassination it came out that Raviv was a SHABAK agent who was basically an agent provocateur. He is portrayed as having groomed and goaded Amir into assassinating Rabin. Or in another version, Raviv set Amir up as a patsy who didn’t know he was actually firing blanks.

On top of that, the Eyal organization was used by the SHABAK to besmirch the reputation of the settlers and the extreme right through false flags and similar actions. Or to take the name of a chapter from Morrison’s book on the assassination: “The Shabak Invents a Jewish, Right-Wing Terrorist Underground.” Frankly, as much as I abhor the settlers and the right wing and am perfectly willing to believe they are every bit as violent and horrible as we’ve been led to believe, I suspect that, as with everything else we have been *led* to believe, *it isn’t true*. Or at least is only partially true.

What I mean is, the revelations of SHABAK’s actions have a ring of truth, although they were spun in the following limited-hangout way: Rabin was trying to delegitimize opposition to Oslo by sending in agents provocateurs to delegitimize the right wing by making them seem even more militant and crazy than they already were. That may be the full extent of it, but it wouldn’t surprise me in the slightest if this was a much more widespread operation that is still ongoing, if only because we’ve learned that Intelligence always manufactures both sides and leads them to irreconcilable extremes.

² They are called “national” religious to distinguish them from secular Zionists on the one hand and the non-zionist ultra-orthodox religious on the other (the ones who wear the big black hats and grow long sideburns). The national religious are also orthodox Jews, but they follow a strand of Judaism that is fully aligned with Zionist goals. The national religious includes ideological settlers, but it also includes a large segment of the population within Israel’s borders. I don’t remember the exact figure, but about 50% of this group does not believe Amir killed Rabin. And they’re right, but they still think Rabin is dead.

Of course, the SHABAK setting up the national religious angle does double duty, because by spinning the theory into "Amir was a well-meaning patriotic Zionist who was set up by the SHABAK," it instantly discredits the conspiracy theories in the eyes of members of the mainstream and left who view that group with suspicion and disgust. They will say, "How preposterous! And anyway, everyone knows what a bunch of violent crazies they are. As if they couldn't have done such a thing!" This deepens the divide even more as it further erodes any common ground the two sides might find. Will they ever realize they are being played against each other by the people at the top who don't seem to give a crap about their fellow Jews? I won't hold my breath.

We can peel back the onion one layer further, because it was also disclosed that Yigal Amir had been sent by the SHABAK to Riga three years before the assassination. From Chamish:

Yigal Amir spent the spring and summer of 1992 in Riga, Latvia, on assignment from the Liaison Department of the Prime Minister's Office, usually called Nativ. In one of the greatest ironies of the assassination drama, it was Prime Minister Rabin who was ultimately responsible for assigning Amir to the Riga post. Or to put it another way, Amir was an employee of the man he was blamed for murdering....

Nativ was and is a nest of spies. Founded in the early 1950s as a liaison between Israel and Jews trapped behind the Iron Curtain, over the years, according to *Ha'aretz* (November, 1995), "It had developed its own independent intelligence and operational agenda."

A hint of what that means was revealed in June, 1996, when the Russian government arrested, and then expelled, a Nativ worker named "Daniel" for illegally acquiring classified satellite photos. Indignant, the Russians threatened to close all of Israel's immigration offices in the country. The indignation was renewed in January, 1997, when "Daniel" was appointed Nativ's head of intelligence.

Another source of indignation is the fact that Nativ has been granting visas to Israel for major criminals including members of the Russian mafia and a former president of the Ukraine who escaped to Tel Aviv with \$60 million stolen from his country's treasury....

Within days of the assassination, the government went on full tilt to explain away Amir's Riga sojourn. First, the government admitted that Amir was a Hebrew teacher there for five months. But since he had no teacher's degree, nor spoke Latvian, the story didn't wash. So Police Minister Moshe Shahal explained that Amir was a security guard there for only three months. That explanation had its drawbacks, as elaborated by Alex Fishman in *Yediot Ahronot*, who wrote, "As a guard [Amir] he was trained by the Shabak in techniques and weaponry, training he used to deadly effect on that miserable Saturday night in Tel Aviv."

The government clearly didn't like Amir's Shabak ties speculated upon, so Aliza Goren, the spokeswoman for the Prime Minister's Office, told reporters, "Amir was never in Riga and anyone who reports that he was is being totally irresponsible."

That ploy fell to bits when the B.B.C.'s Panorama program interviewed Amir's family and filmed his passport. Stamped within was a bold C.C.C.P. Goren had lied and by implication was guilty of covering up a fact the government clearly did not want known.

Speculation was rife by the beginning of 1996 that Amir was on an intelligence mission on behalf of the Prime Minister's Office in Riga. So Israel Television's Channel One broadcast a long interview with Moshe Levanon, the former head of Nativ. He insisted that his organization had no intelligence ties and then presented a series of photos illustrating his work. Included was one of him standing with former C.I.A. Director George Bush, apparently in Russia.

Amir was in Riga for a reason, and the mild-mannered soldier returned in the fall of 1992 with a changed personality. He was now Amir, the campus radical of Bar Ilan University.

Something happened in Riga to alter his mind set. But whatever it was, Amir was still not quite capable of murder. Avishai Raviv had his job set out to exploit Amir's psychological weaknesses and transform him into a political assassin.

Ugh. I just hate it when they try to jerk my chain like that! Chamish takes us almost all the way there but then pulls us back just at the last moment. Did it ever occur to him that Amir didn't have an "inexplicably changed mindset" but had simply been reassigned to a new project and was playing his part? That he was still working for the "prime minister's office" (which is a common euphemism to describe SHABAK agents) as part of this other spook agency? And, am I the only one who noticed an almost scene-by-scene remake of the Oswald story arc? I know they like to recycle their greatest hits (or just like to play it safe by sticking with what works, like making sequels to hit movies: "Oswald II: This Time, We Admit He's Jewish"). But still you could be a bit less obvious about it, guys. And for those of you playing along at home, I hope you've noticed that this assassination screenplay shares many parallels to the JFK one.

I'm going to finish up here with a quick word about [Chamish](#). I discovered his work shortly after my "wakening" a couple of years ago. He fits the Rabin assassination into a [much broader story he tells](#) about the legacy of Sabbatai Zvi and the "Sabbatean Jews." The story of Sabbatai (Shabtai) Zvi is that he started a millenarian trend in Judaism in the 1600s, which taught that a reversal of all the commandments would bring about the coming of the Messiah. So Sabbateans are supposed to be pretty perverted, evil folks—like Satanists or Luciferians without the Baal worship. At some point Zvi was forced by the Ottomans to

convert to Islam or die. Zvi and his followers converted, but they allegedly maintained their belief in secret. . . so in other words they were crypto-Jews. According to this story, Weishaupt's Illuminati was co-founded by Jacob Frank, who was a Sabbatean. Basically, if you were to plug this conspiracy theory into the work Miles has done (though you shouldn't), instead of saying Jews or crypto-Jews, you would say Sabbateans. Except for a few problems. One being that the Sabbatean story only starts in the late 1600s, and we know this has been going on for much longer. And another being that, as Miles showed rather convincingly in [his masterful paper on the Occult](#), the story around Shabtai Zvi makes absolutely no sense. After I read that paper, I realized that Chamish's story of Sabbatean influence in world affairs had to be wrong. Later on I realized he wasn't just wrong, he was misdirecting. LYING. Additional evidence for that comes from his book on UFO sightings in Israel in the 1990s. More on that psyop another time. But I do find it noteworthy that he admits that crypto-Jews are basically running things.

The portrait that theorists like Chamish paint is that Rabin was taken out because he had decided to pull the plug on Oslo and take a stand against the NWO, where "leftists" like Shimon Peres and John Kerry were dutifully implementing the CFR agenda. (They were also evil Sabbateans.) I think Chamish even says somewhere that there was a secret deal to give Jerusalem to the Pope or some such nonsense. In other words, the people who killed Rabin are portrayed as traitors of the Jewish people, by which is meant the religious Zionist settlers and other right wingers. But apparently the people who buy this are blind to the fact that the Zionist enterprise is itself a project of the deep state, or Intelligence, or the NWO or the CFR or whatever label you want to use. Recall that the Balfour Declaration was actually written by Lord Milner of the Rhodes-Milner roundtable, which spawned the CFR. The UN, that infamous organ of the NWO and alleged enemy of Israel filled to the brim with alleged anti-Semites, passed the declaration that created the state of Israel in the first place. We saw that Rabin spent his life fighting for the creation and defense of Israel. So how, exactly, was he *not* aligned with the powers that be?

But, you might protest, the details are more complicated than that. Yes, I know. And that's on purpose. Just like with these mainstream conspiracy theories, it makes it easier for people to get lost in the details and fail to see the broad picture. They can't see the forest with all the trees blocking their view. That way they can be led to believe that someone like Rabin or, say, Trump is an enemy of the deep state rather than a willing accomplice of the powers that be.

[Miles: It is perhaps helpful to understand that Rabin was 73 at the time of the alleged assassination. So for those of us asking why Rabin would agree to be part of this, that helps answer that question. He was ready to retire and may have already been ill. He doesn't look too good in the pic under title, does he, smoking his death stick. But as we have seen before, these people don't like to retire as a normal person would, waving goodbye and collecting a pension. No, why waste a retirement or death when you can blow it up into a propaganda hoax

of major proportions? Why settle for a quiet retirement when you can manufacture a noisy assassination instead?

It is also useful to know that Rabin is the one who ordered the Entebbe Raid. Also a hoax.* But Josh or I will have to hit that another time. However, since that was a pretty obvious False Flag, it confirms that Rabin was not above staging huge events. As a taste of Entebbe, notice the long Wiki page for this event doesn't tell you who the two Palestinian hijackers were. It also doesn't explain why the head of the PFLP-EO, Wadie Haddad, was not tried for his role in masterminding the hijacking. The head of the PFLP, George Habash, is another mystery, since although we are told he was convicted *in absentia* for his role in the 1957 Jordan coup, he skated the charges. They apparently couldn't find him, though he remained—very high-profile—in the area for decades. He dodged jail time again in 1968, when he allegedly escaped from a cell in Syria. Right. Although the PFLP was supposed to be the most famous militant group against Israel in the 1970s—responsible from many hijackings—Habash was never seriously inconvenienced for this, dying of old age at 81 in 2008.]

*Netanyahu's older brother was allegedly the Israeli leader of the Entebbe Raid.