



Commentary...

Trump, Iran and Israel: The Perils of a Narrow Nuclear Deal

By Israel Kasnett

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's trip to Washington today for an urgent meeting with U.S. President Donald Trump underscores Israel's deep concern that a renewed diplomatic process with Iran, moving quickly and under intense political pressure, could lead to a narrow and strategically insufficient agreement. The urgency of the moment is heightened by Trump's decision to position a massive U.S. armada near Iran, including carrier strike groups, advanced aircraft and naval escorts in the Gulf and Arabian Sea, intended to signal resolve and back diplomacy with force.

Yet as Eytan Gilboa, an expert on U.S.-Israel relations at Bar Ilan and Reichman universities, and former Israeli National Security Adviser Meir Ben-Shabbat warn, military pressure without clear political red lines risks becoming set dressing for a deal that is expedient but dangerous. They caution that military pressure without strategic clarity risks enabling precisely the outcome Israel fears most: a narrow nuclear deal that restores Iran's legitimacy and resources while leaving its core threats intact.

Gilboa, also a senior researcher at the BESA Center for Strategic Studies, told JNS that Iran interprets the U.S. buildup through the prism of Trump's overriding preference to avoid war. Tehran does not underestimate American power, but appears convinced that Trump views the threat of military force primarily as leverage.

"At the moment, Trump and Iran share a short-term interest in avoiding war," Gilboa explained. "That convergence does not necessarily include Israel."

Iran's strategy, he added, is shaped by its belief that "Trump does not want war," a calculation that encourages Tehran to test limits while avoiding outright confrontation.

Ben-Shabbat, now the president of the Misgav Institute for Zionist Strategy and National Security, added that from Iran's perspective, the very existence of negotiations already constitutes a strategic gain.

"From the standpoint of the Iranian regime, the very fact that talks are taking place already provides it with a series of benefits," he told JNS.

Talks blunt international pressure, weaken the morale of regime opponents, and gradually erode the credibility of military action, he said. Time, Ben-Shabbat stressed, is Tehran's most valuable asset. By dragging out negotiations, Iran seeks to turn diplomacy into what he described as "a containing and wearing mechanism" that exhausts its adversaries while preserving its own freedom of action.

Despite the visible military pressure, both experts caution against the assumption that a nuclear agreement is close. Iran has shown limited openness to discussing constraints on its highly enriched uranium stockpile, but it has firmly rejected the principle of zero enrichment, a central Israeli demand. "When people talk about a nuclear deal, they assume it's close," Gilboa noted. "But there is a substantial gap between the two sides," even on the nuclear issue.

This gap places Trump in a political bind. Having famously condemned the 2015 Obama-era nuclear deal as disastrous, he now needs any new agreement to appear tougher while still avoiding war. Iran understands this dilemma and is pushing for a narrowly defined deal that confines negotiations to the nuclear file and excludes missiles, regional aggression and proxy warfare. For Israel, the danger is that such an agreement, reached under the shadow of overwhelming U.S. military power, would provide Tehran with economic relief and

renewed legitimacy while preserving its most destabilizing capabilities.

Ben-Shabbat stressed that from Israel's perspective, the worst outcome is not war but a bad agreement, because it would "give the regime oxygen to

breathe at its most difficult moment."

A narrow deal would enable continued military buildup, strengthen Iran's regional posture, and institutionalize future crises. By contrast, Ben-Shabbat argued, "a situation in which there is no agreement at all is preferable to a bad agreement," since sanctions would remain in place and continue to undermine the regime's survivability.

Both experts emphasized that Israel's concerns extend far beyond the nuclear file. Ballistic missiles and proxy forces pose immediate threats that nuclear deterrence alone cannot neutralize.

Gilboa warned that "missiles are not theoretical weapons," noting that they can be employed below the nuclear threshold to devastate cities and infrastructure. A deal that ignores these dimensions risks entrenching instability rather than preventing it, he said.

Despite their personal rapport, Netanyahu and Trump do not share identical priorities. Netanyahu seeks to preserve credible military pressure and prevent diplomatic outcomes that strengthen Iran over time. Trump seeks to avoid war and secure a legacy-defining achievement.

"Netanyahu wants the United States to operate militarily," Gilboa told JNS. "Trump wants to avoid war." This divergence makes direct, high-level coordination essential, particularly as Washington navigates negotiations under the cover of massive military deployments.

Israel is not opposed to diplomacy. Both Gilboa and Ben-Shabbat emphasized that Israel would accept a diplomatic solution if it is comprehensive, enforceable and strategically meaningful. To assist Trump in further understanding the Middle East, Israel must frame its arguments in terms he values, he said: American credibility, deterrence and historical legacy. Any agreement reached under the shadow of U.S. carrier groups must be demonstrably tougher than its predecessor and backed by real enforcement mechanisms, they added.

The challenge for the United States and Israel alike is ensuring that the display of American power near Iran does not become a substitute for strategic rigor. As Ben-Shabbat explained, lasting security will not come from managing Iran's ambitions, but from ending them. Until then, even the largest armada offshore cannot compensate for a deal that trades long-term stability for short-term convenience. (JNS Feb 10)

Israel to Present 'Uncompromising Position' on Iranian Threats

By Yaakov Lappin

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu arrived in Washington, D.C., for a pivotal meeting with U.S. President Donald Trump on Wednesday, during which Israeli concerns and red lines regarding Iran's nuclear program and missile production are expected to take center stage.

While diplomatic channels between Tehran and Washington remain open, assessments indicate that Iran is racing to shield key elements of its nuclear program from potential aerial attack. At the same time, Tehran is working to rebuild a missile industry badly damaged in recent conflicts.

According to a report by i24 News, Iran aims to restore a short-term stockpile of roughly 2,000 missiles—about the same number it possessed on the eve of Operation Rising Lion in June 2025. During that operation, Iran is believed to have lost between one-third and half of its missile arsenal, along with roughly two-thirds of its launch

capabilities. Since then, it has been moving rapidly to reconstitute those losses.

Brig. Gen. (res.) Prof. Jacob Nagel, former head of Israel's National Security Council and a former acting national security adviser to the prime minister, who is now a senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, told JNS that Israel is preparing to present a clear and uncompromising stance.

"Israel's uncompromising position, which the prime minister intends and needs to present to the president in their upcoming meeting, is a substantive, deep and final treatment of all four problematic axes vis-à-vis Iran," Nagel said.

He listed those axes as Iran's nuclear program, ballistic missiles, support for terrorism and oppression of the Iranian people.

Nagel expressed deep skepticism that Iran's current leadership would accept such demands. "Since there is no chance that the current Iranian leadership will accept anything close to these requirements, we must prepare for the 'other treatment' that Trump has cited many times," he said.

Nagel described this alternative path as a military option that could "bring the people out to the streets again and lead to the replacement of the corrupt and oppressive Iranian regime. No other way will solve the problem at the root."

In a related analysis published in Maariv last week, Nagel warned that any agreement granting Iran sanctions relief or access to significant funds would enable Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps to seize control of the money, wait out Trump's term and rebuild Iran's terror networks and missile arsenal.

He added that such a scenario could allow Iran to break out toward nuclear weapons after 2028, when Trump's second term would end.

"This result would endanger not only U.S. allies and American forces in the region," Nagel said, "but would also mark a betrayal by the American president of millions of Iranians who despise the regime and the tens of thousands murdered by it."

While diplomacy continues, activity on the ground inside Iran suggests preparations for further confrontation. A report released on Jan. 29 by the Institute for Science and International Security described an accelerated effort by the Iranian regime to bury critical infrastructure at the Esfahan Nuclear Complex deep underground.

Satellite imagery from late January shows extensive construction activity at the site's tunnel complex. "As of January 29, the entrance is blocked by dirt," the report said of the central tunnel entrance, while "fresh soil heaps appeared outside of the southernmost entrance."

According to the institute, these burial efforts suggest preparation for additional military strikes, similar to measures taken ahead of U.S. strikes during the 12-day war last June.

Iran is also reportedly attempting to smuggle in planetary mixers—specialized industrial machines essential for producing solid propellant for advanced ballistic missiles. Twelve such mixers were destroyed in an Israeli strike in October 2024, creating a major bottleneck in Iran's solid-fuel missile production.

Solid-fuel missiles require far less preparation time before launch than liquid-fuel systems, which must be fueled in advance and are therefore easier to detect.

In December 2025, U.S. Special Forces intercepted a cargo ship in the Indian Ocean en route from China to Iran, seizing military equipment intended for the IRGC, according to a Dec. 12 Wall Street Journal report.

Taken together, these developments point to a consistent picture: Iran remains vulnerable, but is rapidly rebuilding its missile and military capabilities.

Nagel warned that if the United States agrees to a diplomatic framework focused solely on uranium enrichment levels, it would amount to little more than a holding action—allowing Iran's missile program, which Israel views as a future existential threat, to continue developing unchecked. Such a scenario, he said, would increase the likelihood of independent Israeli action. (JNS Feb 11)

The Virus of Jew-Hatred on the Right is Spreading

By Jonathan S. Tobin

It was the last thing observers ought to have expected to witness at a hearing of the U.S. Religious Liberty Commission in Washington, D.C. The discussion was supposed to highlight the Trump administration's strong opposition to the surge of antisemitism that has spread around the country and across the globe since the Hamas-led Palestinian Arab terrorist attacks in southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023. But what took place on Feb. 9 illustrated something else.

The meeting was hijacked by one of the commissioners, former "Miss California" Carrie Prejean Boller, who went on an extended rant of Jew-hatred. In so doing, the C-list, right-wing celebrity managed to highlight a growing problem that has perplexed the Jewish community as well as Republicans. President Donald Trump has been successfully leveraging the power of the federal government to pressure a leftist dominated academic establishment to reject the antisemitism that has been mainstreamed since Oct. 7. But while he's been doing that, a significant portion of his own electoral coalition is mimicking the same blood libels that pro-Hamas mobs and their enablers among the Democrats have been plugging for the past two years and more.

Boller's performance created a brief firestorm that the administration quickly sought to put out. Her behavior, however, was a reminder not just of the virulence of Jew-hatred that is spreading. It also made clear that its adherents are not marginal figures confined to the fever swamps of the far right, but instead, have a firm foothold inside the Trump camp.

This has confounded the Jewish and pro-Israel communities, who were already having a hard enough time trying to focus on the admittedly far greater threat of antisemitism on the left. And it provided yet another example of why the stakes in an increasingly bitter debate about what can be done about it are so high.

During the course of the hearing, Boller, who was wearing a pin with American and Palestinian flags, claimed that "Catholics do not embrace Zionism." While the hearing was aimed at providing testimony about how Jewish students are being targeted by left-wing Israel-bashers and how anti-Zionism is indistinguishable from antisemitism, Boller seemed determined to speak up for the cause of the Jew-haters.

She declared that notorious antisemites like political commentators and podcasters Tucker Carlson and Candace Owens were merely opponents of Zionism and innocent of the prejudice that they regularly platform. She also demanded that a witness testifying about hatred and bigotry on college campuses "condemn" Israel for its war on Hamas in Gaza.

Her comments generated justified outrage—not only at her, but at the president for having the bad judgment to reward her for her support for his re-election with a post on the commission. Despite calls for her resignation from many on the right, Boller vowed that she would "never bend the knee to the State of Israel. Ever." She also echoed Carlson's vicious attacks on evangelicals and Christian Zionists, and showcasing a twisted version of Catholicism in which Jews and Israel are depicted as enemies of American conservatives. That heretofore obscure sector of the right has been getting greater notice since Carlson hosted "groyper" neo-Nazi leader Nick Fuentes on his program—and then was defended by the otherwise pro-Israel and anti-antisemitic Heritage Foundation, including its president, Kevin Roberts.

Two days later, the commission's chairman, Texas Lt. Gov. Dan Patrick, who had tried to rein in Boller at the hearing, announced that she had been removed from her post. That, in turn, set off a brushfire of criticism from the far right, including by Owens, claiming that the "Zionists" had exerted their nefarious influence and removed the former beauty queen and Trump supporter because she was a "Christian."

It doesn't really matter whether this is the last that we'll hear from Boller, who is someone who has a talent for generating controversy. She was forced to give up her beauty-queen title for (depending on which version of the story you believe) either expressing her opinion about gay marriage or for having made a sex tape. Since then, she has married a former NFL quarterback and gone

on to become a loud opponent of gender ideology and supporter of Trump.

What does matter is how the virus of Jew-hatred that is spreading on the right can be contained and rolled back. The seriousness of the problem was made even more obvious at the Turning Point USA America Fest in December. When Vice President JD Vance declared himself neutral in the debate about the spread of antisemitism that broke out between conservative commentator Ben Shapiro and Carlson, that not only signaled his sympathy for the latter. It also indicated a clear breach in the movement and among administration supporters over the question of whether there was room in their collective tent for antisemites.

And it's far from clear whether anyone in the world of pro-Israel and Jewish activism has a handle on what to do about it.

This was brought into focus last month at the Second International Conference on Anti-Semitism in Jerusalem, when prominent author Yoram Hazony gave a speech that was interpreted by some as blaming the problem on the failures of Jews and pro-Israel activists to sufficiently explain the issue to a broad cross-section of people on the right. It generated blowback not just toward Hazony for what seemed like a tone-deaf response to the situation, but to the entire idea of an alliance between Jews and the national conservative movement.

Hazony heads the Herzl Institute and the Edmund Burke Foundation, the latter of which has hosted a series of NatCon conferences where prominent conservatives like Vance have spoken. His ideas about the failure of liberalism and the reasons why nationalism is important to the defense of Western civilization and Jewish security, rather than an inherent threat to it, have rightly gained a wide audience in recent years. But the movement that he has helped found is now under fire for its alliance with a sector of the right, a significant portion of which is now showing itself hostile to Jews and the Jewish state.

Hazony condemned Carlson's antisemitism. Still, he argues that the Jewish world has failed to reach people like Vance, as well as a rising generation of conservative activists who seem to be listening to Carlson and even Fuentes. That is undoubtedly true. But by focusing on the failures of what he called the "antisemitism-industrial complex"—a reference to Jewish establishment groups like the Anti-Defamation League—he seemed to be blaming the Jews, as opposed to those who target the Jews. That may not have been what he meant; regardless, the damage was done, and it has given an opening for those who opposed his ideas all along to claim that recent events have discredited them.

I don't agree. I think the focus of the Natcons on a more common-god version of conservatism—stressing the importance of faith, tradition, nationalism and opposing globalist economics—is entirely correct. But while I've been a vocal critic of the ADL, what has happened with Carlson and his supporters isn't the organization's fault. It's a function of a revival of a particularly noxious brand of Jew-hatred that has a long history on the right, dating back to Father Charles Coughlin in the 1930s to Pat Buchanan in the 1990s. And, as is the case with left-wing antisemites like New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani, there is no way to compromise with them or sweet-talk them into giving up their ideological obsessions with scapegoating Jews.

It may be that Vance will realize that his presidential ambitions—right now, he is the clear GOP frontrunner in the 2028 presidential race—are incompatible with a stance of neutrality or a lack of concern about right-wing antisemitism. If so, that will cause him to cut his ties with Carlson. Nor is there any reason why he or other prominent Republicans should turn on Israel the way Carlson has. Indeed, Vance has at times shown himself to be an advocate for the U.S.-Israel alliance.

But if he won't disown Carlson, then it is incumbent on all decent people, including those who rightly see great merit in national conservatism and its defense of the West, to cut ties with him. The same must apply to anyone on the right who, like Carlson, opposes the idea of a Judeo-Christian heritage (something that is antithetical to national conservatism), and who makes common cause with leftist antisemites and anti-Zionists.

The focus on right-wing conservatism isn't a plot against Vance, the Trump coalition or national conservatism. Antisemitism is never

caused by anything the Jews do. It is always a manifestation of the neuroses and the willingness of political factions to use hatred against this particular minority to gain power.

Opponents of antisemitism and supporters of Israel must seek to persuade a generation of young people to disdain the voices of the woke right. Those who haven't been on trips to Israel—or who may have been influenced by far-right ideas and the pervasive woke leftism in the education system—must realize that they are making a mistake by going down the rabbit hole of antisemitism. They need to reach those being misled into believing that their Catholic faith is antithetical to support for Israel and Zionism—something that was made clear at the Religious Liberty Commission hearing. But just like the effort to roll back the woke tide on the left that Trump has championed, that won't be accomplished by going easy on the haters.

Doing so may come at a political cost. Yet it shouldn't break up the burgeoning national conservative coalition. That movement includes both American and European right-wingers who also reject the erasure of borders and the war on Western civilization that the woke left has been waging. Many of these people are natural allies of Israel and the Jewish people. But if it does, then so be it.

The hate speech of Carlson, Owens and Boller and the failure of some prominent figures on the right to condemn them must never be condoned, rationalized or excused. Those who would pull their punches in combating right-wing Jew-haters out of a concern for maintaining partisan alliances are just as profoundly wrong as liberals who do the same thing with erstwhile allies on the left. (JNS Feb 11)

Mamdani and the Collapse of 'Liberal Zionism'

By Jonathan S. Tobin

When former New York City Mayor Eric Adams created an Office to Combat Antisemitism last May, it was widely interpreted as a political gesture intended to boost his failing independent run for re-election in November. Adams had always been broadly supportive of Israel and the wider Jewish community. But his move was too little and too late—both to do much about the surge of antisemitism that followed the Hamas-led Palestinian Arab terror attacks on Israel on Oct. 7, 2023, and to save his mayoral campaign.

Adams dropped out of the race in September, six weeks before Zohran Mamdani was elected to succeed him. Mamdani, an avowed opponent of the existence of the State of Israel and a supporter of the pro-Hamas mobs who were the shock troops of the wave of Jew-hatred that swept across the country, hasn't abolished Adams's pet project. Similar to his predecessor, the motive for this is political. While Adams used it to signal his somewhat ineffectual support for the Jewish people, Mamdani seeks to employ it to provide cover for the fact that he is still doubling down on his anti-Zionism and efforts to link that noxious cause to other items on his agenda, such as opposing the Trump administration's effort to crack down on illegal immigration.

To do this, he has appointed Phylisa Wisdom, a veteran left-wing activist, to lead it.

Wisdom's main qualifications seem to consist of a worldview that is sympathetic to Mamdani's political program—with one exception. According to The New York Times, she is a "liberal Zionist," which the paper seems to define as someone who has "criticized Israel's conduct in Gaza" while still believing in "Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state."

New York City Police Commissioner Jessica Tisch is the one holdover from the former administration who seems to be motivated by a real desire to hold the line against Jew-hatred in law enforcement, as well as to possibly further her personal future political ambitions. But Wisdom's post isn't nearly as important as the one that controls the police. Like the situation last year, it's far from clear what, if anything, it can do about the epidemic of antisemitism in New York, highlighted by the fact that hate crimes against Jews rose a staggering 182% in Mamdani's first month in office.

This is hardly surprising. Avowals notwithstanding, Mamdani's ardent anti-Zionism is indistinguishable from antisemitism since he denies Jews rights that neither he nor anyone else would think of denying to any other people.

Wisdom's significance, therefore, comes not from how much she can contribute to the effort to reverse that trend, but how it symbolizes what has happened to the idea of "liberal Zionism" in the 21st century. If acting and speaking as she has done is what it means to be a liberal Zionist today, then a real disconnect exists. It's not merely time to realize that the phrase has lost its original meaning; instead, we must understand that those who have appropriated that label are neither Zionist nor authentically liberal.

In theory, those who identify as political liberals have an important role to play in rallying support for Israel and Zionism within the Jewish community and the non-Jewish world. Adherence to liberalism—whether in the form of the classical school of political thought that prized individual liberty above all, or even just as a label that most members of the Democratic Party applied to themselves—can be entirely compatible with Zionism. Indeed, for most of the history of the modern Zionist movement, the natural affinity between liberal economic and political ideas and the effort to facilitate the self-determination of the Jewish people in their ancient homeland was patently obvious.

But as Wisdom has demonstrated in the course of her career, in practice being an avowed "liberal Zionist" means acting as an ally of those working to undermine and even destroy the Jewish state, whose existence she says she supports. At the same time, she is also aiding a cause that is fundamentally illiberal.

Let's start by noting that claiming to be a supporter of Israel and an opponent of antisemitism while serving in a Mamdani administration represents a contradiction in terms. There may be some who say that it is important for the Jewish community to have a voice among the mayor's advisers. But this is no ordinary mayor of New York. The 34-year-old chief executive of Gotham is someone whose entire brief political career has revolved around his obsessive opposition to Israel's existence and Jewish rights.

Even if we assume that someone like Tisch is sincere in her desire to steer the city's government in a way that will help protect Jews, it's already apparent that she's deceiving herself. Whatever checks she or someone in Wisdom's office can try to put on the mayor's ideological fixation about Israel and Jewish life will be outweighed by the way the mayor's rhetoric and actions are legitimizing and mainstreaming Jew-hatred.

Though Mamdani may disingenuously pledge his desire to protect Jews, even his half-hearted statements about protecting synagogues from pro-Hamas mobs send the message that he is on the side of the attackers. Those who think they can influence him or somehow lessen the harm he will cause by serving him are deceiving themselves. To collaborate with Mamdani in any way is to commit to compromising one's own morality far more than it could ever influence him.

Still, it is just as important to look at Wisdom's stands and ponder whether they are in any way compatible with a traditional definition of liberal Zionism.

A glance through Wisdom's social-media posts, a litany of her political stands or those of the New York Jewish Agenda (NYJA) group that she has led since July 2023, reveals someone who is most interested in bashing Israel, in addition to providing aid and comfort to those who seek to take it down. Indeed, the main point of that group is to provide a platform for the "as a Jew" version of modern Jewish life. That is an all-too-common trend. It is a means to comment about Israel by using one's Jewish identity to legitimize arguments seeking to treat virtually any effort to defend it as illegitimate or a crime.

The position of NYJA is indistinguishable from that of J Street, which started out claiming to be both "pro-Israel and pro-peace." In practice, the group became a mouthpiece for those who were determined to impose suicidal concessions to the Palestinians that had been repeatedly rejected by the Israeli people. In the wake of Oct. 7, J Street and NYJA ultimately found themselves mainly acting to support the efforts of those who sought to prevent Israel from attacking Hamas and Iran, and thus to ensure the victory of the terrorists.

Worse than that, they were guilty of lending credibility to the blood libels about Israeli conduct that have been fueling antisemitism. In particular, Wisdom and NYJA repeatedly weighed in to support the false claims that Israel was deliberately causing starvation in Gaza, and in doing so, claimed that the Jewish state was morally equivalent to Hamas. That she did so while claiming to uphold Jewish values is no

defense for this immoral and destructive stance.

In this context, her assertion that she supports Israel's "right to exist" (something that only among all the nations in the world is considered controversial when applied to the Jewish state) is merely a way to justify opposing anything done to defend it from those who are waging a genocidal war to destroy it.

Equally helpful to understanding just how little her positions have to do with liberalism or Zionism is her consistent opposition to the Trump administration's efforts to combat bigotry against students on college campuses. Wisdom opposed the federal government's attempts to hold institutions like Columbia University on Manhattan's Upper West Side accountable for their toleration and encouragement of Jew-hatred, which clearly violates the 1964 U.S. Civil Rights Act. Beyond that, she took up the cause to defend Mahmoud Khalil, a foreign student who was one of the chief organizers of the pro-Hamas demonstrations that targeted Jews at the Ivy League school for intimidation and violence, when the administration sought to deport him for violating the terms of his visa.

Like Mamdani, Khalil isn't merely "pro-Palestinian." He is an active supporter of the campaign to destroy Israel and has a long record of working for anti-Israel groups like the U.N. Palestinian refugee agency UNRWA. But to Wisdom, his antisemitic record and actions were not as important as the imperative to oppose Trump and back his anti-Israeli opponents.

While Wisdom and others on the left claim that this position is a defense of individuals against a repressive state authority, it puts them in the position of bolstering illiberal figures like Khalil, who support the most reactionary and repressive Islamist groups. In this manner, too many contemporary liberals have allowed themselves to be convinced to support racialist theories that undermine the defense of Western civilization and help bolster the war against Jews that Islamists seek to spread.

Mamdani's use of Islamist imagery in his efforts to oppose Trump's willingness to enforce existing immigration laws ought to trouble genuine liberals. The mayor claimed that the Islamic principles and history he invoked were also a reason to support open borders policies in the contemporary United States. But they actually helped form the prelude for Muslim campaigns to persecute Jews during that religion's conquest of the Arabian Peninsula and the Middle East.

A true liberal Zionist might disagree with President Donald Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on many issues. Yet they would support Israel's war on Hamas and oppose the importation of Islamist radicalism into the United States.

There are still many such liberal Zionists. Still, they have allowed leftists like Wisdom to hijack that term and marginalize supporters of Israel on the political left. This is a liberalism that not only won't support Israel, but is determined to disarm those who seek to defend America against toxic Marxist ideas that single out Jews as "white" oppressors. The rise of Mamdani to political power is a function of the way these leftist ideologues have turned the Democratic Party into a haven for anti-Zionists and those who are enabling the surge of antisemitism.

That such a person has been put into a position where their job is to defend Jews against hatred isn't merely ironic. It's a logical conclusion to a process by which liberalism has been subverted by those who oppose its basic precepts that are the foundation of Jewish security. We should treat Wisdom's elevation to this role as not so much inappropriate but as a parody of efforts to combat antisemitism.

More than that, it should be a wake-up call to those liberal supporters of Israel to begin to fight in earnest against the forces that have swept to control of the Democratic Party.

Conservatives are also fighting to fend off antisemites on the right, but there is no question that such figures remain a minority, and that, at present, it is only the Trump administration and its supporters who are actively fighting antisemitism in the United States. If Jewish liberals aren't prepared to resist Mamdani and his Jewish collaborators, like Wisdom, then they should stop calling themselves liberal Zionists and concede that the idea has become obsolete.

(JNS Feb 9)