

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*

בס"ד

Commentary...

If Moses Freed the Jews Today, the UN would Condemn him as a War Criminal By Gerald M. Steinberg

When Jews worldwide sit around the Seder table and retell the 4,000 year old story of the Exodus from slavery to freedom, we have no doubt about the identities of the heroes and villains. Jacob (aka Israel) and his extended family, later to become the 12 tribes, were invited by Joseph and Pharaoh to settle in Egypt to escape the famine, and they prospered.

But then, their descendants were enslaved for over 200 years, and the reigning Pharaoh, concerned that they would join with Egypt's enemies, ordered the murder of male Israelite children – a form of genocide. When the slaves cried out, God heard and appointed Moses to lead them out of the house of bondage through 10 plagues that devastated the entire Egyptian population.

In the finale, the first-born son in every household died (and among their animals), and only then did Pharaoh fold briefly to allow the slaves to march out, carrying unleavened dough on their backs.

Today, if these events transpired, the powerful "human rights" industry, led by the UN and the NGO superpowers (Human Rights Watch and Amnesty) would issue lengthy reports, hold press conferences and publish posts on social media platforms condemning Moses and Aaron as war criminals. The International Criminal Court would issue arrest warrants charging the Israelite leaders with genocide and other versions of the blood libel. Campus mobs under the heading of Students for Justice for Pharaoh (SJP), supported by their "progressive" allies, would be vandalizing buildings, intimidating Israelites (now Jews – descendants from the tribe of Judah), and demanding the return of the runaway slaves to their Egyptian taskmaster.

How did this ludicrous inversion of oppressor and oppressed, and of victimizer and victim take place? Who is responsible for erasing, distorting and appropriating the moral principles that distinguish between right and wrong?

And, most importantly, how can the modern theater of the absurd be shut down, and the core foundations of morality, embodied in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, be restored?

To answer these questions, we begin with the pervasive conspiratorial Jew-hatred anchored in post-Holocaust antisemitism. Its adherents reject any form of Jewish sovereignty in our ancient homeland – the Land of Israel to where the Israelites returned 40 years after leaving Egypt. The essence of today's "Israel derangement syndrome" – as prominently displayed in the activities of Kenneth Roth, who ran HRW for 30 years, and Agnes Callamard of Amnesty International – is not on "occupation" and settlements that followed the 1967 Six Day War.

Rather, the successful creation of Israel and its survival remains the core "crime." The 1947 UN Partition Plan (the original two states for two peoples) and the victory of the Jews over the invading Arab armies were spun into nefarious Zionist plots, aided by the imperialist West. As a result, for them, Israelis have no inherent right of self-defense – all military actions, including after the October 7 atrocities, are automatically and cynically defined as war crimes and worse.

In parallel, Palestinian Arabs (aided by UNRWA and the "refugee" industry) are perpetual victims, and any act against the hated Zionists, no matter how brutal, is embraced as "resistance." In today's backwards world, the EU, NGO and UN network would denounce the ten plagues as a highly disproportionate use of force, and demand the return of the slaves to their Egyptian owners.

This particular and obsessive focus on Israel is accompanied by a

broader anti-Western, anti-democratic ideology that blames Western colonialism for all of the world's problems, and automatically assigns victimhood to "the Third World," Global South, and "people of color." In this

straitjacket of fake history, just as Palestinians are not held accountable for mass murder and barbarism, the same is true for non-Western dictatorships throughout the world.

Other brutal colonial conquests, such Chinese imperialism as the Muslim takeover of much of Africa and Asia are simply erased. For self-appointed high priests of progressive morality, the worst offenders in any conflict are always the Americans and their allies.

This dogma can also be explained as a theme in Christian theology that equates weakness (including victimhood) with morality, and strength with aggressive immorality. Highly distorted interpretations of the laws of war are the direct product of this philosophy. When the human rights propaganda industry is criticized for erasing heinous Palestinian Arab attacks (aggression), the response is to blame Israel, "which relies mainly on force, applied as brutally as deemed necessary." Moses and Aaron could be accused of the same calumny.

Following this non-Jewish model, the polemicist Peter Beinart published a column in the anti-Israel and antisemitic UK Guardian condemning celebrations of Purim for encouraging "Jewish zealotry," declaring: "As Jews celebrate Purim, let us end the slaughter in Gaza committed in our name." In a sharp response, UK Chief Rabbi Mervis berated the false presentation of Purim and the "insidious attempt to cast Jewish history and identity as heartless and vengeful."

With enough money and PR spin, the plagues and the drowning of Pharaoh's military force could also be rewritten to falsely portray the Egyptians as victims of crimes against humanity and genocide perpetrated by the Israelites. In an age where history is simply one of many narratives – and the power of political spin machines under the facade of morality can turn heinous terrorists into victims – anything is possible. (Jerusalem Post Apr 11)

שבת שלום וחג שמח

'Israel Must Put its Own Military Option on the Table' vis à vis Iran By Yaakov Lappin

Nuclear talks between the United States and Iran, which began in Oman on Saturday, have raised questions about the risk of Tehran's exploiting the diplomatic track to gain time and legitimacy for its nuclear program.

The first round of indirect talks between U.S. envoy Steve Witkoff and Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi, mediated by Oman's Foreign Minister Badr Albusaidi, concluded in Oman after a little more than two-and-a-half hours, according to international media reports. The next round of talks is scheduled to be held in Oman on April 19.

According to an April 12 report in The Wall Street Journal, Iran's demands include rapid sanctions relief, access to billions in frozen assets, and an end to U.S. pressure on Chinese oil buyers. In return, Iran might offer to limit uranium enrichment to 3.67%, but is unlikely to reverse existing nuclear progress.

Col. (res.) Dr. Eran Lerman, vice president of the Jerusalem Institute for Strategy and Security, told JNS in recent days that in his assessment, "at least in Trump's mind and in [special United States Middle Envoy Steve] Witkoff's mandate, it is clear that the move [negotiations] must block Iran's path to nuclear weapons so that the North Korean nightmare is not repeated."

An Iranian nuclear breakout would collapse the regional and global order and the Non-Proliferation Treaty, warned Lerman, adding that preventing this from happening must occur "within a limited time." Lerman, a former deputy director for foreign policy

and international affairs at the National Security Council in the Israeli Prime Minister's Office, and an ex-Israel Defense Forces Military Intelligence officer, stated, "If Witkoff is dragged into an open-ended negotiation about the future, accompanied by Qatari and Omani manipulations and every possible Iranian trick, we will enter a dangerous space. Therefore, Israel must put its own military option on the table."

Professor Eitan Gilboa, an expert on U.S.-Israel relations and senior fellow at the Begin Sadat Center for Strategic Studies at Bar-Ilan University, stated during an April 7 conference call hosted by the Jerusalem Press Club that "every time Prime Minister Netanyahu meets President Trump, there's some kind of a surprise," referring to Trump's Oval Office announcement about direct talks with Iran with Netanyahu sitting beside him last week.

Gilboa explained that Iran-U.S. talks contradict longstanding Israeli strategic positions. "Netanyahu does not believe in negotiations. He does not believe that they will produce an agreement. And if they will produce an agreement, Iran is not going to implement it."

He continued, "Netanyahu has been advocating a military action, preferably only by the United States or by the United States together with Israel. And so right now, this military option is gone. It's not in the making. As long as negotiations with Iran are going to be held, there's no military option."

Gilboa warned about Tehran's strategy to prolong diplomacy while evading meaningful restrictions. "Iran is known for exploiting negotiations endlessly to avoid any restrictions about its nuclear program," he said.

He stressed three key questions: How long will the talks go on? Is the United States seeking the complete dismantling of the nuclear program? And would any agreement also cover the Iranian ballistic-missile threat? "If the negotiations were not successful, what are you [the U.S.] going to do about it?" Gilboa asked.

Brig. Gen. (res.) Professor Jacob Nagel, former acting national security adviser to Netanyahu and ex-head of Israel's National Security Council, said during an April 4 podcast published by the Washington D.C.-based Foundation for Defense of Democracies that Tehran's nuclear progress has reached a dangerous stage. "Iran is days away from producing at least a bomb's worth of weapons-grade uranium, [or] multiple bombs worth of weapons-grade uranium within a few weeks," Nagel stated. "They have a large capability."

Nagel emphasized that Iran's current enrichment levels have changed the nature of the threat. "The Iranians save today almost 280 kilos of 60% enriched uranium. ... It's 98 to 99% of the time needed to produce the 93% enriched uranium that you need for a weapon," he explained. "They are really there already. They have the fissile material. They need two, three weeks."

He added, "Some people say that Iran enlarged its nuclear program because President Trump withdrew from the JCPOA. And I think one of the most important works that FDD did is to show that the running to... the bomb or making the biggest violations started only after President Biden was elected, not after President Trump withdrew."

Nagel described the nuclear archive seized by the Mossad from Tehran in January 2018 as clear evidence of Iran's true intent. "There was a command to build five warheads, each one of them 10 kilotons. This is something that we found out in the archive," he recalled. "They saved all the materials. Not for the history, they saved it for the point they would like to continue."

According to Nagel, Washington must set red lines before negotiations. "The only way, if you really want to stop Iran from having a nuclear program, at least for now, is to put a precondition to these negotiations ... rollback. Go back to what your situation was in 2009."

These conditions should include the destruction of Iran's enrichment facilities, the removal of enriched uranium, and the closure of weaponization activities, including ballistic-missile programs, said Nagel. He issued a direct warning about the current talks: "The most dangerous point is to have a bad deal that President Trump will declare as a good deal. The moment this negotiation starts, Israel will be banned from doing what we need against Iran."

In remarks to his Cabinet reported by Walla News on April 9,

Netanyahu stated that Israel knew in advance about the talks between the United States and Iran on the nuclear program. Netanyahu told ministers he had requested that Trump impose a time limit on negotiations with Tehran. He also told the cabinet that Israel is fully coordinated with the American administration on these matters.

Gen. Charles "Chuck" Wald, USAF (ret.), Distinguished Fellow at the Washington D.C.-based Jewish Institute for National Security of America, and a former Deputy Commander of U.S. Military European Command, said during a JINSA webinar held last week that the U.S.'s military posture is robust and ready.

"There are six B2s at Diego Garcia," Wald noted. "That's a very doable type of mission," adding that strikes on Iran from Diego Garcia would be "about a 16-hour round-trip mission."

"And then there'll be other assets as well, the KC46s [refuelers] that are going to be deployed there ... space assets ... a lot of intelligence assets. There are going to be a lot of drone-type assets, and a lot of ground and air-launch cruise missile-type assets."

He estimated that 5,000-pound bunker-busting bombs and other bombs are ready for deployment. Wald said that once such a strike begins, "you've got to go after their [Iranian] nuclear capability and their [Iran's] ability to expand their mission out into Israel again with their missiles."

He added, "We can't treat the Iranians the way we wish they were. We have to treat them the way they are. I have very little faith that the negotiations are going to work, and I have a real high probability in mind that we're going to have to do something militarily." (JNS Apr 15)

Israel's 'Privileged Class': Its Roots and its Rot

By Yisrael Medad

Observers of the clashes and jockeying going on in Israel these past several years are perhaps puzzled by, at times, the ferocity of the antagonism being displayed by the opponents of Benjamin Netanyahu. It has passed the benchmark of disagreement over policies as in other countries as well as in years past here in Israel.

Over the last few elections, politicians have moved from the right to the left and from the left to the right. Academics and cultural figures are divided over whether to placate the Arab enemies or pummel them. Yet the clear animosity being expressed at demonstrations and the new battlefield—social-media platforms—is of a hype that is constantly shrill, derogatory, and ultimately, dangerous. Let us not forget the flares fired at the prime minister's private residence, one shooter being a retired rear admiral, aged 63, and another incident when, at the home of a prominent leader of the Brothers in Arms anti-Netanyahu group, a small arms cache was discovered.

Is it only just politics? Can Netanyahu legitimately be portrayed as an authoritarian figure? Are the Likud positions truly "extremist"? Or is there something beneath the surface, perhaps psychological? Maybe a remnant of disputes from decades ago, resurfacing as elements of a struggle of historical proportions between the camps of Zionism? I suggest that a good place to review the competition and the antipathy in an event that occurred during the Passover week of 1933.

On April 17, 1933, the concluding seventh day of the holiday, more than 500 Betar members strode down Tel Aviv's Allenby Road at the end of a movement conclave. Due to tensions between the Revisionist camp of Ze'ev Jabotinsky and the Mapai party of David Ben-Gurion, a discussion had taken place how to respond to Betar's growing influence at a meeting of the Histadrut Executive on March 28, 1933.

Ben-Gurion had proposed "a series of actions, one more militant than the next," as professor Anita Shapira wrote in her 1981 article, "The debate in Mapai on the use of violence, 1932-1935." While rejected, an atmosphere of initiated violence took hold of the rank-and-file. When the youngest of the Betar members, the 8- to 12-year-olds, reached Carmel Street, bottles and stones flew from the side alleyways and rooftops. As Shapira noted, "many of the children required first aid."

The following day, the Davar newspaper ran the headline: "Tel Aviv Demands: 'Remove Hitler's Vile Uniforms From Among Us'" about the brown-shaded movement shirts, reminiscent of the German S.A. cadres. Thus began a systematic campaign designed to justify what had taken place. The attack was described as a spontaneous outbreak, and the blame was placed on the Betarim themselves. In the wake of the violence, Berl Katznelson resigned his executive Histadrut position.

An April 20 editorial in Haaretz expressed sorrow and concern that this was no "unforeseen spontaneous outbreak." The writer noted that fliers were pre-prepared, and "gangs of fists" were primed for action. Eleven years later, the Palmach hunted down and handed over Irgun members to the British in the "Saison Operation," and four years after that, the Altalena arms ship was shelled on the order of Ben-Gurion not far from Allenby Road.

At the beginning of November 1932, just a half-year earlier, Jabotinsky presciently had published these words: "The time has come to call things by their proper name: the takeover by the 'leftists' in the Land of Israel will lead to knife fights between Jews themselves. Not just fights, but knife fights, and as yet, I see no guarantee that the process will stop at the use of cold weapons. This prophecy has an unpleasant ring to it; but people would have to be blind golems to doubt it."

Too many people presume that the dividing lines between the Zionism pursued by the Socialist labor wing, which created the Histadrut trade union and Mapai political party, with a constellation of other more Marxist factions and the Revisionist movement of Ze'ev Jabotinsky, which evolved into Herut and then the Likud, and its more nationalist sections centered mainly on the policies directed at external forces.

These battles were needed to fight the British regime in pre-state days, and the proper approach to the danger presented by Arab terror from pre-state days on. However, other insular conflicts transpired over domestic elements such as economic and societal concerns, ideological and practical.

In January 1925, Jabotinsky published an essay titled "The Left" and with it began his decades-long dispute, which continued after his death well into the early 1970s, and still exists, of whether Zionism should revolve around class interests or national concerns. While he declared that "those whom we call 'leftists' could be the best of the Zionists," he thought them wrong in their approach.

What irked him at first (and then brought him almost to despair) was the insistence of Ben-Gurion and comrades that the primary goal of Zionism was an economic transformation of the Jewish people, then engaging in a "land-building" project and only then, and eventually, a Jewish state.

For Jabotinsky, this was "dangerous." He insisted that "our task is not to 'build the land' but to gradually transform this land into one with a Jewish majority." To him, Labor Zionism's path was an "aberration." And why? What would develop, he asserted, was that the small-scale incremental achievements became the goal of Zionism's efforts, and the big picture would be pushed into a someday future.

Worse, the multi-institutional complex developing—from trade union to sick fund to newspaper to publishing house to sports clubs and so forth—was creating a hegemony that would dominate not only pioneering enterprises but also superiority in social, diplomatic and political fields. Anyone not of the "camp" would be ostracized, even punished. Jabotinsky dreaded that the left wing would assume a privileged, overlordly stature. And it did.

In order for a chalutz ("pioneer") to immigrate to the mandate territory, a certificate was required. That certificate depended solely on the whim of the Jewish Agency, and that body handed out those certificates based on an unfair "key": the results of the Zionist Congress elections. And here and there, protekzia. That process, for all intents and purposes, was repeated as regards employment opportunities and the right to obtain land for agricultural settlement purposes.

That attitudinal hegemony crept into Israel's civic consciousness in the form of the phrase "the red booklet," signifying membership in the Histadrut. Without that precious item, one was set

apart. A shadow fell over the pre-state Yishuv, and what developed, especially following the influx of immigrants in the first five years of statehood from Arab lands, was a division between First Israel and Second Israel.

If, at first, the social cleavage was once based on the pre-state ideological divide between the Jabotinsky camp and that of the Histadrut, after the state's founding, those non-Europeans who arrived from Arab states found themselves, as once described, in a reality whereby "the pecking order had been [already] defined—and arrived, moreover, possessing none of the tools for attaining power."

The term "Second Israel" was popularized first in a series of articles on the conditions in the immigrants' transitory camps in Haaretz in 1951 and an Oct. 8 speech by Ben-Gurion that year. Alex Weingrod published in 1962 an article in Commentary titled, "The Two Israels," and it was he who highlighted the pecking order imagery.

The term reappeared when the Black Panthers protest group became active in 1970 and especially after the Likud 1977 electoral victory based on Shlomo Avineri's 1973 "Israel: Two nations?" article. The Second Israel was a socio-economic and cultural categorization of those who were newcomers, mostly from Middle Eastern countries, who lived in the periphery. They were Sepharadim or Mizrachim. They were un-Western.

According to Weingrod, the Second Israel is "recent, and its origins are in Muslim lands; it is the Israel of Yemenite villages and Moroccan development-area towns, Tel Aviv slums and the old Kurdish quarter of Jerusalem." And the First Israel? It is the Israel of "the early generations of European immigrants—the Israel of pioneering visions ... the veteran kibbutzim, fashionable north Tel Aviv and Jerusalem's elite Rechavia." It is based on the "ideology of the collective and cooperative agricultural settlements and the worker-controlled industrial economy."

The fact is that an extensive network of political, economic, academic and cultural power entrenched itself and, to a great extent, remains in the hands of the founding generation's progeny—from grandparents to grandchildren and, by now, great-grandchildren. They are the core of the revolt of the elites we have witnessed these past two decades. (JNS Apr 16)

Thomas Friedman is Decadent and Depraved

By Benjamin Kerstein

In a year-and-a-half of terrible things, few of those things have been more terrible than the total failure of the American Jewish ruling class.

Few are willing to acknowledge that the American Jewish community has a class system, but like all communities, it does. Consisting of numerous self-appointed leaders and an alphabet soup of organizations, the American Jewish ruling class maintains its privilege based on the implicit understanding that it has one job: to protect the American Jewish community from antisemitism.

Yet when confronted with the first large-scale American antisemitic movement in nearly a century, this class completely collapsed. It failed to muster up even minimal resistance to the barbarians and left its people to face them alone.

The reason is simple: privilege. Rarely has a group or community faced an elite so committed—perhaps unconsciously—to its own selfish interests and outdated prejudices. Bloated on six-figure salaries, perfidious "allies," and useless political "connections," the American Jewish ruling class had long since become decadent, catamitic, and powerless. It could never have resisted the attack. In fact, for months, it could not even acknowledge that it was happening at all.

One of the most egregious members of this class is New York Times columnist Thomas L. Friedman. Friedman is, in many ways, an inexplicable phenomenon. Supposedly an expert on international relations and especially the Middle East, he has been wrong about more or less everything for decades. His missives usually consist of far-left shibboleths concealed beneath the rhetoric of squishy liberalism. He regularly expresses unabashed contempt for the

consensus view of the American Jewish community while presenting this contempt as the consensus view of the American Jewish community. He is also, somewhat tangentially, one of the worst writers in the Anglophone world, with a prose style so excruciating as to set any discerning reader's teeth on edge.

I sometimes wonder at what point Friedman's obvious charlatanism will finally become too much even for the New York Times and its media sycophants. But this time is unlikely to come: He is far too useful.

Yet it cannot be denied that Friedman remains some kind of a thought leader. The reason is obvious: Friedman is astoundingly and quintessentially privileged. Lucky or wily enough to marry a woman worth several billion dollars, Friedman lives the kind of rarified life that most American Jews—contrary to popular stereotypes—will never know. He holds a position at America's newspaper of record, which, for other privileged Americans, inexplicably enjoys a halo effect that makes his every incompetent analysis seem like the voice of God.

American Jewish thought leaders, however, have proven no more effective or admirable than American Jewish political and cultural leaders. Their collapse has been absolute. But Friedman's collapse is more than absolute. He has collapsed into defending antisemitism itself.

In an April 8 column (I don't link to systemically antisemitic publications), Friedman unleashed a scathing attack on President Donald Trump and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. And amidst a barrage of seething clichés, Friedman vehemently defended a movement that is explicitly dedicated to the destruction of the American Jewish community.

It is impossible to truncate the relevant passages without compromising the evidence of their appalling nature, so I reproduce them in full:

Trump's and Netanyahu's domestic strategies have truly merged with the weaponization of antisemitism as a way to silence or delegitimize critics. Readers of this column know that I have zero respect for any campus protesters who bash Israeli actions in Gaza without uttering a word of censure for Hamas — let alone a word of support for Ukrainians whose democracy is being savaged by Vladimir Putin's Russia. But ours is, for now, still a free country, and if people aren't engaging in violent acts, or harassing other students in or out of class, they should be free to say whatever they want, including advocating a Palestinian state of whatever size they want.

"President Trump has taken a real phenomenon that needs to be addressed — antisemitism that emerges out of debates on Israel — and is using it to justify crackdowns on immigration, higher education and free speech on Israel," Jonathan Jacoby, national director of the Nexus Project, which works to fight antisemitism and uphold democracy, said to me.

As an American Jew, I neither need nor want Trump's cynical defense. He is still the man who, in 2017, defended the white nationalists and neo-Nazis who protested in Charlottesville, Va., as including "some very fine people." Vance has also embraced Germany's Nazi-sympathizing, Holocaust-trivializing AfD party, whose leaders have called on Germans to stop atoning for Nazi crimes.

As Rabbi Sharon Brous of the Los Angeles congregation IKAR eloquently warned in a March 8 sermon: "We, the Jews, are being used to advance a political agenda that will cause grave harm to the social fabric, and to the institutions that are best suited to protect Jews and all minorities. We are being used. Our pain, our trauma, is being exploited to eviscerate the dream of a multiracial democracy, while advancing the goal of a white Christian nation."

There is a stunning amount that is wrong about this rant. In fact, there is everything wrong with it. But the key phrase is: "Ours is, for now, still a free country, and if people aren't engaging in violent acts, or harassing other students in or out of class, they should be free to say whatever they want, including advocating a Palestinian state of whatever size they want."

But these people are universally engaging in violence, harassing students, and advocating for a Palestinian state not just of any size but one that replaces Israel entirely while slaughtering and/or expelling its

Jewish population. Friedman, with the walls of privilege around him, feels free to ignore all of this, and this is a terrible and unforgivable dereliction. The reason is the human cost of his apologetics.

Over the past year and a half, I have heard innumerable horror stories from Jewish students about the atrocities and civil rights violations to which they have been subjected. At least one of those students told me they were planning to make Aliyah as a result of what they saw and experienced. In other words, young Jews are literally leaving the country because of the antisemites Friedman defends. They see no future in the United States that so many Jews have always seen as the future.

Friedman knows none of this because he cannot or will not. The walls of privilege are high and he has no desire to know what lies beyond them. It is far too frightening and, like all members of his class, Friedman is a coward.

What this amounts to is frankly horrifying, because Friedman is basically saying: Well, yes, the American Jewish community will be destroyed, but at least our enemies' right to commit hate crimes against our children will be protected.

In other words, Friedman believes that, for the sake of abstract ideals that have never been applied to the Jews, American Jews should commit suicide. Indeed, he has decided that committing suicide is the moral thing to do.

I do not think I am alone in believing that there is nothing moral about this whatsoever. It is, in fact, a demonic position to take. What any genuinely moral person does in a situation of existential threat is to support whatever helps them strike down their mortal enemies.

The contortions required to justify Friedman's refusal to acknowledge this are indeed impressive. For example, he appears oblivious to the fact that Trump and Vance's remarks about the Nazis and the AfD are simply irrelevant. They change nothing about the people Friedman is defending. Those people are still genocidal antisemites who want to destroy the American Jewish community, and we know they are because they say so at every possible opportunity. They prove that they mean it by acting very much like Nazis themselves. Yet Friedman appears to think that fantasies of a "white Christian nation" are somehow more of a threat than a mass movement that quite literally wants to kill all the Jews.

The sad and appalling truth is that Friedman has assimilated into himself the worst of all antisemitic lies: That the Jews are under some kind of moral obligation to consent to their own degradation and destruction. That is not just deranged; it is monstrous. It is, in fact, quite evil. No one is obligated to do such a thing. Indeed, people like Friedman are perfectly willing to acknowledge this whenever they start babbling about Israel's alleged transgressions against the Palestinians.

Friedman's internalization of the lie that Jewish suicide is morally admirable is also an expression of privilege on a world-historical scale. If I had billions of dollars I didn't earn to protect me from the world, I might feel the same way. But I don't and most Jews don't either. As a result, we know something that Friedman does not: The lie is a lie. The Jews' dark history has earned us the right to resist any and all attempts to degrade and destroy us.

The truth is that Friedman's self-debasement proves only one thing: The Jews of Privilege are dead; they just don't know it yet. Their world is gone. If it ever existed, it was murdered on Oct. 7 itself. But it is clear that, in their death throes, they are perfectly willing not only to throw their own people under the bus but demand that the rest of us praise and admire them for it.

But those of us who are not privileged, or at least earned our privilege, have no intention of doing so. Friedman believes that his privilege makes him safe. But we know that he is not safe. None of us are. The entirety of Jewish history proves it. For the Jew, privilege is nothing, because it can all be ripped away overnight. Friedman will learn that someday, and it will not be a pleasant experience for him.

As for the rest of us, we do not intend to wait for such a dark revelation. We know what is happening and we intend to fight it. We would appreciate it if Friedman and his entire decadent and depraved ruling class got out of our way. (Substack Apr 10)
