

ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee of
Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

בש"ז

Events...

Monday, February 2, 7pm

BAYT presents International Law Expert **Natasha Hausdorff**.
Register at TinyURL.com/2026IAI.

Commentary...

Burying Ran Gvili, but not the Israeli Spirit By Ruthie Blum

"Ran, thanks to you, all of Israel was reminded that we are one great and strong nation," Talik Gvili said while eulogizing her son at his funeral. "Take care up there to unite everyone."

She uttered these words on Jan. 28, two days after Ran Gvili's body was located in and retrieved from Gaza—two years and nearly four months after his murder and abduction at the hands of Hamas. The 24-year-old master sergeant in the elite Yasam unit of the Israel Police wasn't on duty when southern Israel was invaded by thousands of terrorists; he was at home awaiting surgery for a broken shoulder.

Nevertheless, he donned his uniform, grabbed his weapon and rushed to battle the killers on the loose. Despite his injury, he fought bravely, taking out more than a dozen terrorists by himself. It was only when he ran out of ammunition that he was gunned down and dragged into the Strip, where he was held for the next 843 days.

He is now referred to as the "first in and last out." Indeed, there are no more captives left in Gaza, against all odds and widespread skepticism.

This is among the points that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stressed during his press conference on Jan. 27, during which he announced the completion of the "sacred mission" of returning all the hostages.

"I have heard not one or two people saying with endless emotion, 'It's unbelievable that we brought Ran Gvili home,'" Netanyahu said.

"[But] it is indeed believable. I believed. I believed we would return them all. I believed it even when, at the start of the war, a very senior official in the security establishment said, 'We must get used to the fact that we might not see even one hostage return to Israel.' I believed it even when they told me, 'Prime Minister, you must stop the war. You must leave Gaza. Yes, you must comply with Hamas's demands, because otherwise, we simply won't see the hostages here.' But I believed otherwise."

He went on, "I believed that through the combination of military and diplomatic pressure, we could, and would, bring all of our hostages back home. Because what is important in war, more than anything else, is to ignore the background noise, to stand with composure against pressures from home and abroad, to understand what needs to be done and to strive with all our might to ... achieve the goal." He also described dozens of meetings with hostage families whose loved ones he vowed to retrieve from Gaza, crediting Israel's soldiers and commanders, the wounded and the fallen for their part in defending the country.

"Many generations will draw inspiration from Ran Gvili, a hero of Israel, and from all our other heroes, whose courage was revealed in all its glory in the War of Redemption," he said. "This is the generation of heroism. This is the generation of victory."

Within minutes, the "anybody but Bibi" knives came out.

Naftali Bennett, former (and future wannabe) prime minister, accused Netanyahu of "dividing and polarizing," insisting that "a good leader glorifies his people, not just himself"—as though honoring fallen soldiers and defending strategic resolve were acts of ego.

Opposition leader Yair Lapid declared that "whoever wants to take credit for the hostages who returned must also take responsibility for the victims, the murdered and the greatest disaster to befall the Jewish

people since the Holocaust." Without skipping a beat, he made it sound as though Netanyahu, not Hamas, was the culpable party.

Yisrael Beiteinu Party head Avigdor Liberman offered the familiar bromide that "it's time

for leadership that leads, not just reacts."

Gadi Eizenkot, former chief of the Israel Defense Forces and a former War Cabinet member, accused Netanyahu of staging press conferences to "conceal the depth of the failure," claiming that only American coercion forced Israel's hand, while supposedly compromising Israel's security superiority.

Interesting how these paragons of ingratitude felt at the funeral when Talik requested of her fallen boy that he unite a fractured nation from his perch in heaven. One thing they all know is that healing societal wounds requires a suspension of animus—at least temporarily. But that would mean acknowledging that certain occasions shouldn't be poisoned in the pursuit of toppling Netanyahu. Ran Gvili's Jewish burial in Israel is but one example. Others, unfortunately, abound.

Still, most Israelis are not politicians or pundits. They're not professional protesters or full-time activists. They're people with sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, spouses and close friends who fought—and continue to do so—in Gaza. Many are now bereaved. And they don't appreciate being told that the fallen died in vain for a lost cause or due to the political recklessness of a prime minister whose only aim is to keep his seat.

These are the Israelis who wept watching footage of IDF soldiers singing "Ani Ma'amin" ("I Believe") upon learning that Gvili had been found. These are the citizens, like the Gvili family, who cherish reminders of the heart and soul—and Zionism—that bind us as a people.

Herein lies the irony that the haters don't seem to grasp: The more they claim that Netanyahu was actually the obstacle to freeing the hostages—going as far as to claim he wanted them dead—the less success they will have at replacing him on election day. (JNS Jan 29)

Stop Arguing Theology: Confront Antisemitism Where it Lives

By Jeff Ballabon

With the surge in public expressions of Jew-hatred emerging from some quarters of the American Christian right, a familiar impulse has resurfaced, especially among well-intentioned Jews and Christian allies. The reflex is to treat antisemitism as a theological problem that can be solved by refuting supersessionism (also known as "replacement theology" by detractors and "fulfillment theology" by champions).

The logic is straightforward: If supersessionism historically contributed to hostility and violence against Jews, then defeating it theologically should weaken antisemitism at its source. This instinct is sincere but counterproductive.

Some context on this internal Christian dispute: Supersessionism holds that biblical references to "Israel" apply spiritually to the church rather than to the Jewish people as a continuing covenantal nation—a view long present in Catholic, Orthodox, mainline Protestant and some Reformed traditions. By contrast, dispensationalism, which rose to prominence in 19th-century Protestantism, and is most common among evangelicals and non-denominational churches, maintains that God's covenant with the Jewish people remains distinct and ongoing. Both frameworks have been debated for generations; neither is monolithic, and adherents of both can be found across denominations and political orientations.

Supersessionism is not mere theological oversight waiting to be corrected by better proof-texting. It's not a matter of poor reading comprehension. It's a durable interpretive framework nearly 2,000 years old, debated by sophisticated thinkers invoking the same scriptures for as long as those scriptures have been read. No New Testament verse recited by an Israeli diplomat, no angry exegesis by a Twitter warrior, and no self-soothing interfaith conference of

Jewish and Christian Zionists is going to settle a question that has never been settled because it cannot be—at least not on textual grounds.

Nor is theology a reliable indicator of intent or danger. Supersessionists are not all hostile to Jews and Israel, just as dispensationalists are not all friendly. Treating theological camps as moral litmus tests thus obscures more than it reveals and produces both false confidence and misplaced alarm based on labels, rather than conduct.

There's also a more basic problem that rarely gets stated plainly.

Most Jews engaging in these debates lack depth in their own religious background, let alone mastery of the texts and interpretive traditions they aspire to refute. At the same time, few on the Christian side—whether arguing for or against a continuing covenantal relationship between God and the Jewish people—can actually read the verses they cite in the original languages. Instead, both sides rely on layers of translation, paraphrase and inherited talking points, often many removes away from the Hebrew, Greek or Aramaic originals, and filtered through centuries of polemics.

Smugly quoting a handful of verses is thus worse than pointless. It's a lousy communications strategy, poor public relations, as well as a good way to alienate friends and inflame enemies.

Which is why neither observant nor secular Jews should be in the business of arguing for a Christian dispensationalist reading of the Christian Bible. We don't share Christian theology, hermeneutics or exegetical traditions. We don't accept the premises or authorities of those debates, and pretending otherwise for tactical convenience is easily exposed as intellectually dishonest and strategically reckless.

Telling Christians that they don't understand their own scripture when it comes to the Jews is no more productive than being told by Christians that Jews don't understand ours when it comes to Christ. It raises hackles and almost always reinforces the most hostile interlocutors. Christian rebuttals to dispensationalism have existed for generations, just as rebuttals to supersessionism have. Nothing new is being introduced and no minds are being changed when the challenger is a Jew. The result is predictable: hardened positions, deepened resentment and the empowerment of those who thrive on dispute and division.

More importantly, the entire approach misses the real issue.

Antisemitism does not primarily function as a theological disagreement. It functions as a conspiratorial mode of thinking—a psychotic pathology that treats Jews not as ordinary moral agents but as a malevolent force operating behind events, power and history. Christian theology can supply language for this impulse, just as nationalist, progressive, socialist, racist or Islamist narratives can. But it's not the engine that drives it. That engine runs just as easily in secular, revolutionary or post-religious movements.

This is why arguing theology is futile. You are engaging on terrain where your interlocutor is entrenched, rehearsed and unconcerned with persuasion. Worse, you reinforce the premise that Jewish existence itself is a problem to be adjudicated, rather than a reality to be respected.

The current moment, properly understood, is not religious; it is civilizational, cultural and political.

The response, therefore, must be practical and pragmatic, instead of theological or theoretical. In fact, it is better not to treat it as a “debate” at all; a debate must presume shared premises and a common standard of resolution. Neither exists here. What does exist is the collapse of a shared societal value set; a vacuum that is fueling social pressures, incentives, fears, anger, ambitions and power dynamics. Understanding those forces—and reframing relationships, accordingly—is far more effective than attempting to adjudicate ancient interpretive disputes.

This is where conspiracy thinking becomes central.

Going down conspiracy theory rabbit holes is not only philosophically or morally wrong; it's self-defeating. It has never advanced truth, protected communities or strengthened societies. It distorts priorities, undermines credibility and invariably harms those who embrace it.

Periods of upheaval always produce a glut of manipulators. When fear is high and trust is low, scapegoating becomes easy and even profitable. Unsurprisingly, we are now awash in voices exploiting the

current moment. Inflaming suspicion and anger is far easier than grappling with difficult and complex reality.

And this warning is not primarily for Jews. It is for society itself.

Scapegoating Jews has been tested for millennia. It benefits predators, grifters and demagogues in the short term, but devastates every society that succumbs to them. Every civilization that turned Jews into a symbolic explanation for its failures believed it was solving a problem. None survived the solution.

The resurgence of Jew-hatred is America's early warning signal. The task before us is not to take sides in doctrinal arguments or play amateur theologians in traditions that are not our own. It is to deny legitimacy—to stigmatize—the demagoguery of those who would demonize and dehumanize “the Jews” by making us the avatar of their own fears and failures. That is where antisemitism lives, and that is where it must be confronted. (JNS Jan 26)

Phase 2 of the Gaza Ceasefire and First Principles for Peace

By Bruce Pearl

The first anniversary of President Trump's inauguration reminds us of a central truth: No other American president could have achieved what he has accomplished in Gaza and across the region.

Working directly with all parties—without appeasement, duplicity or compromising Israel's or America's safety and security—President Trump succeeded where others failed. Unlike administrations that attempted to “play both sides,” his leadership delivered results.

Under his watch, over 70 living American hostages were freed. History will record that this outcome was not the product of phone calls, symbolic diplomacy or economic compromise, but of strength, clarity and unwavering resolve.

Among the Trump administration's most consequential foreign policy achievements is the Israel–Gaza ceasefire agreement reached in October 2025 that secured the release of all remaining living Israeli hostages. During his visit to Israel for the signing, President Trump addressed the Knesset, declaring, “This is the historic dawn of a new Middle East.”

On Jan. 15, 2026, he announced the creation of the Board of Peace, anchored by a “comprehensive demilitarization agreement with Hamas.” This was not a hollow slogan—as has too often characterized previous Middle East engagements—but a strategy that produced measurable outcomes benefiting both Israel and the United States.

The president was right—history was made. Yet as we move into Phase 2 of the Gaza peace plan, we cannot forget about finishing Phase 1. The Hamas threat extends beyond its existing military infrastructure and must be the focus if we are serious about giving lasting peace a chance.

Deradicalize: Hamas is not merely a militant organization; it is a deeply embedded ideology that permeates Gaza. Any viable future for the territory must begin with deradicalization. The defining political principle uniting Gazans today—just as it was in 2006 when Hamas was elected in a democratic vote—is the rejection of the Jewish state. Over the past two years, Israel has significantly degraded Iran's terror proxies in Gaza, Lebanon and Yemen, while expanding the Abraham Accords to new partners in Central Asia and West Africa. Israel is not going anywhere. Until Gazans come to terms with that reality, progress will remain impossible.

Re-educate: Deradicalization must be reinforced through comprehensive education reform. Gaza's school curriculum, which demonizes Jews and glorifies violence, must be replaced with one that promotes coexistence and peace.

It is long overdue to confront the antisemitic, hate-filled materials embedded in UNRWA-funded schools throughout Gaza. True generational change begins with bold, systemic educational reform. Over four decades working on college campuses, I have witnessed firsthand the power of education to shape societies for the better. Former Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir once said, “Peace will come when the Arabs love their children more than they hate us.” That truth remains as relevant today as ever.

Disarm and Condition Reconstruction: There can be no peaceful or prosperous future for Gaza while it remains armed. That includes

ensuring there is no Turkish military presence in Gaza, blocking a pathway for Islamists to receive arms. With the support of the United States and its allies, Israel must fully demilitarize the Strip and remove the jihadist extremists who have inflicted decades of devastation on the region.

Not one penny should be spent on rebuilding Gaza until meaningful progress has been made in these three domains. Moreover, we must incentivize voluntary migration that encourages radicals and habitual troublemakers to leave.

Humanitarian aid must continue for health, food and safety, and education reform should begin immediately. But reconstruction cannot be rushed. To rebuild too soon would reward the perpetrators of Oct. 7 and reinforce the dangerous lesson that terrorism pays.

The world today is safer and more prosperous because of the United States' decisive diplomatic and military leadership over the past year. To preserve these victories and secure lasting stability in the Middle East, we must confront the realities in Gaza with honesty, discipline and strength. President Trump has shown that peace is possible, but only when it is grounded in principle, accountability and unwavering resolve. (America First Policy Institute Jan 24)

The writer is a former American college basketball coach.

Horseshoe Theory has Become a Crutch By Josh Warhit

Conversations about the political mechanics of antisemitism often default to horseshoe theory. Observers track antisemitism's prevalence at the political fringes to see where on each end things go sour, and notice ostensible opposites producing near-identical narratives fixated on Jews.

This approach captures part of the picture, but it assumes a stable small-“l” liberal center to retreat toward—and that no longer exists. The center’s core assumptions have stopped working, and political disagreement has been reoriented away from policy optimization and toward explaining who is responsible for the gap between expectation and reality.

Antisemitism, of all things, emerges at these moments because modernity inherited a symbolic archive of “the Jew” as the figure who refuses the world’s truth. Centuries of religious hostility toward Jews allowed this archive to accumulate conceptual inertia. When transcendence receded as a source of meaning, modernity stripped the archive of God and refilled it with race, psychology and metaphysics, transforming Jews from heretics obstructing salvation into obstacles to political progress, national coherence or universal liberation.

The theological accusation was not abandoned; it was secularized into political theory and absorbed into the Enlightenment’s intellectual DNA. This is how the Enlightenment carried centuries of anti-Jewish blame forward into the very structure of modern reasoning—and why any system built from that inheritance would retain the same ready-made culprit when its assumptions give way.

For the illiberal far right, Jewish belonging threatens the idea of an immutable nation. For the illiberal far left, Jewish continuity is seen as a betrayal of global progress toward a homogenized universal collective. Small-“l” liberal worldviews managed to distinguish themselves from such currents by advocating pluralism, minority rights and religious freedom—principles that made Jewish particularism easier to accommodate. But these internal commitments did not make liberalism immune to antisemitism. They merely held off its emergence as long as liberalism believed in itself.

Now that liberalism no longer believes in itself, it is stirred by temptations it resisted until recently. In this state, the distinction between left and right within the liberal segment of the political spectrum becomes negligible in terms of susceptibility to antisemitism.

Liberals on the left are animated by the belief that people should blend, moving freely across geographic and cultural boundaries. While they don’t believe in forcibly stripping away particularist loyalties, as illiberal elements further to their left do, they do tend to interpret such loyalties and the borders that sustain them as obstacles to a future of global cooperation and equality.

When that ideal fails to materialize, these liberals don’t concede that they have misread human nature. Instead, they ask: “What corrupting power is preventing our dream of global cooperation from manifesting?”

Meanwhile, liberals on the right believe that their in-group should limit such movement and maintain its composition, with events beyond its boundaries affecting neither what it does nor how it looks. While they don’t believe in enforcing hierarchy by law or denying equal civic standing to citizens, as illiberal elements further to their right do, they are nonetheless intent on preserving their identity and autonomy, and thus tend to prefer insulation from the turbulence of global affairs.

When reality dashes this hope, these liberals don’t concede that the vision of national self-containment was too simplistic. Instead, they ask: “Who is dragging us into wars we never wanted? Who is preventing us from keeping to ourselves and preserving who we are?”

While these hopes and accompanying questions differ, the logic of collapse is the same. This is why two men as divergent in their politics as far-left journalist Peter Beinart and far-right podcaster Tucker Carlson can converge (with notable intensity) on the idea that “Zionism” and “Zionists” are blocking the realization of their respective moral projects.

That the language is “Zionists” rather than “Jews” can appear, on the surface, to mark a moral or intellectual distinction that insulates liberal actors from participating in antisemitism. History suggests otherwise. Across the 20th century, illiberal movements hostile to Jewish continuity relied on this framing. In the name of “anti-Zionism,” Jewish identity was repressed in the Soviet Union and Jewish communities were eradicated across North Africa and the Middle East.

That the same illiberal currents now mark Jews and their supporters—“Zionists”—as acceptable targets of shaming and abuse in Western capitals is disturbing, but not surprising. When figures like Beinart and Carlson employ the same framing, however, it is especially unsettling, precisely because they have not suddenly become illiberal.

Beinart is not a Third-Worldist, and Carlson is not a neo-Nazi. They have not shifted horizontally to extremes, but have instead collapsed into antisemitism from within the liberal tradition. Far from abandoning their liberal assumptions, they cling to them with idealist fury long after reality has stopped cooperating. (JNS Jan 29)

Don’t Mourn the Holocaust While Supporting the Genocide of Living Jews By Jonathan S. Tobin

What does it say about a country where some rudimentary knowledge about the Holocaust is commonplace, but where misleading analogies about it are a routine occurrence in public discourse?

You can ask the same question about the use of the most important term to come out of the Shoah.

The word “genocide” was coined in its aftermath to describe the systematic mass slaughter aimed at the extermination of a single people. But in a country where it is estimated that about three-quarters of American K-12 students get lessons on the murder of 6 million Jews by the German Nazis and their collaborators, it is regularly misapplied to the efforts of the descendants of the survivors of the Holocaust to defend themselves against an attempted genocide.

As the world commemorates International Holocaust Remembrance Day this week on Jan. 27, the most important question to be asked about public discussion is not so much how to expand education programs devoted to the subject. Rather, it is whether Americans are being taught anything that will help them to understand the topic or what it means today. Even more to the point, it may be necessary to acknowledge that much of what is being taught in schools or said at the ceremonies that will mark this day may actually be doing more harm than good.

As a result, the reaction of the Jewish community to the fuss made about the date ought not to be gratitude for the undoubtedly efforts of many educators and public officials for keeping the memory of the Six Million alive. Rather, it should be to doubt not only the value of these efforts, but to tell many of them that we’d appreciate it if they simply stopped talking about it.

The point being: If you are promoting memorialization of the Shoah while at the same time dishonoring the memory of the heroes and martyrs of the Holocaust by appropriating their fate to promote

some entirely unrelated cause or to express particular displeasure with someone or political foes, the response of the Jewish world should be to tell them to stop.

Even more important, those who cry crocodile tears about the suffering of dead Jews who were slaughtered by their persecutors more than 80 years ago, while smearing live Jews with false charges of genocide, have forfeited their right to speak about the subject.

Unfortunately, that is the proper response this year to all too much of what will be said at countless commemorations of the Holocaust. The subject has been weaponized for political purposes or even to buttress the surge of antisemitism that has spread around the globe since the Hamas-led Palestinian Arab attacks in Israel on Oct. 7, 2023.

One fact that should be noted is that the Jewish people have still not recovered demographically from the disaster of the Holocaust, during which approximately one-third of all Jews alive in 1939 were murdered. Today, the global Jewish population is still far smaller by a factor of about 3 million people than it was in 1939, with half the Jews alive today living in Israel.

Yet many of those who will publicly beat their breasts on Jan. 27 in sorrow about the Six Million are effectively neutral or even in support of the war that Palestinians—backed by much of the Arab and Muslim world, and fashionable opinion elsewhere—are waging against Jews. Rather than joining them alongside political leaders, journalists, scholars and celebrities who have been part of a growing effort to demonize the one Jewish state on the planet, the response of the community to such events should be a loud and emphatic, “No, thank you!” Honoring the memory of the Holocaust is a sacred obligation. Yet it cannot be done effectively or have any real meaning in a context divorced from the current struggle for Jewish survival against a rising tide of bigotry, hatred and violence.

It is entirely true that Holocaust deniers are not only still among us, but that their visibility and ability to reach the ignorant and ever-gullible consumers of conspiracy theories is greater than ever. For that, the internet can be thanked for the way it has enabled fringe figures once confined to the fever swamps of public discourse to be visible to large audiences. The willingness of podcasters, like former Fox News host Tucker Carlson, to mainstream hateful figures like faux historian Daryl Cooper and neo-Nazi Nick Fuentes plays a large part in this.

But as much as the promotion of these hate-mongers’ lies about the past remains problematic, far too much discourse is distorted among those who don’t believe such falsehoods, though still decide to traffic in Holocaust language and references.

When Minnesota Gov. Tim Walz compared efforts by federal officials to enforce existing laws against illegal immigrants, especially those who have committed crimes, to the efforts of Nazis seeking to capture Jews like Holocaust diarist Anne Frank, the problem isn’t just the cynical appropriation of her memory to pursue a political agenda. Walz is far from the first to behave in this manner. Some on the political right have done the same thing when it comes to opposition to abortion. But in recent years, opponents of President Donald Trump have made false comparisons of him to Adolf Hitler or claimed that he is a Nazi or fascist. It has become so ubiquitous that it almost isn’t worth it to single any of the offenders out.

The problem is not that Walz is unaware of the Holocaust. We know he is not. He is like so many people who have come of age in an era when most Americans possess at least a rudimentary understanding of the basic facts about what happened under the Third Reich. And yet, he and the many others who invoke Frank’s name or use epithets linked to the Holocaust when attacking political foes apparently don’t understand it at all.

Far too much of what passes for Holocaust education is rooted in an attempt to universalize it—to render it not merely more understandable to contemporary audiences but to separate it from its context and the history of antisemitism. In that way, some otherwise well-meaning educators have sought to use it to teach everyone to be nicer to each other and to avoid slipping into racial or religious prejudices. But as scholar Ruth Wisse has taught, antisemitism is not a garden-variety form of hate or intolerance. And it is not merely the oldest hatred. Rather, it is specifically used as a political weapon over and above the way imperfect human beings are prone to slip into unkind or even mean behavior.

The universalization of the Holocaust and the way students are

taught a slimmed-down summary of this chapter of history—in brief lessons crammed into the school year—has had unforeseen consequences. It has led to something that survivors, whose numbers are fewer and fewer every year, never envisioned when they began the campaign to spread knowledge of their experiences.

The Holocaust has become a metaphor for anything that people dislike. The predilection to treat anyone with whom we strongly disagree as if they were Hitler is not just a product of the hyperpartisan tone of 21st-century politics or the extreme polarization of the Donald Trump era. It is also the result of the way it has been universalized to the point where many, if not most, ordinary people think it was just a bad thing that happened a long time ago—not the specific result of millennia of Jew-hatred and the powerlessness of nearly an entire people.

Equally unfortunate is the way much of the educational establishment has embraced toxic leftist ideas like critical race theory, intersectionality and settler-colonialism. So-called “progressive” teachings have largely captured primary, secondary and higher education to the point where a generation of Americans has been indoctrinated into believing not merely in concepts that exacerbate racial divisions, but ones that promote the idea that Jews and Israelis are “white” oppressors.

This movement produced the pro-Hamas campus mobs that have targeted Jewish students for intimidation, discrimination and violence since Oct. 7 at universities around the world. Participants are shockingly ignorant of the history of the Middle East, even as they chant slogans endorsing Jewish genocide (“From the river to the sea”) and terrorism against Jews everywhere (“Globalize the intifada”). What they have also done is to appropriate the word genocide, which Holocaust survivor and lawyer Raphael Lemkin coined to describe the Nazi effort to exterminate the Jewish people.

Their claim that Israel’s just war of self-defense against Hamas terrorists is “genocide” is a blatant lie. If applied to any other conflict, it would mean that every war that has ever been fought, including the one waged by the Allies against the Nazis, would be considered genocide. That not only drains the word of its actual meaning. It is, like the libelous efforts to smear Jews as Nazis, a classic trope of antisemitism.

Yet many on the political left, which has embraced this lie about Israel, are also prepared to join in mourning the Holocaust. Some, including that small minority of Jews who, for distorted reasons of their own, join in these antisemitic denunciations of Israelis and their supporters, even claim that they are inspired by the history of the Shoah to speak out against Israel now. Some even support efforts to eradicate the Jewish state—a result that could only be accomplished by the sort of genocidal war that Hamas and its allies are waging.

Our answer to them and others who are either silent about the misappropriation of the Holocaust or join in the blood libels against living Jews while lamenting the fate of dead Jews must be unequivocal.

We must tell those, like Walz, who misappropriate the memory of the Six Million, or utter such falsehoods about genocide, like New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani and others on the intersectional left wing of the Democratic Party, that Holocaust commemorations should be off-limits to them.

The same applies to global organizations like the United Nations, which in 2005 voted to establish International Holocaust Remembrance Day on the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz on Jan. 27, 1945. These agencies that claim to speak for human rights and justice for all countries in the world have become cesspools of antisemitism and engines of the war against the Jewish state.

For too long, too many members of the Jewish community have treated the promotion of Holocaust education or ceremonies honoring the dead as more important than efforts to defend the living.

It’s also true that, as important as teaching young Jews about the Shoah is, it must be linked to learning about the importance of Israel, as well as the life-affirming nature of their heritage and faith.

Above all, we must stop allowing the memory of what happened 80 years ago on Europe’s soil to be used by those who support or are neutral about those seeking to carry on the Nazi project of Jewish genocide. The failure to call an end to this misuse of Jewish history will only contribute to more tragedy. (JNS Jan.26)