



Jerusalem 6:38  
Toronto 8:00

## 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*

7"סב

Sheikh Jarrah. On May 10, just two days after Quds Day, Hamas sparked a war by launching a barrage of rockets at Jerusalem.

Muslims living in London, Paris, Los Angeles, New York and Miami attacked Jews in those

cities, who had not realized they were IDF reservists. Why were they being targeted so far away from the actual theater of war? No one even asked them if they were Zionists.

The bloody festivities began early this year, with a wave of terrorism against Israelis throughout March and early April. Fourteen have been killed: a terror attack in Bnei Brak and another in a bar in Tel Aviv; additional murders in Hadera and Beersheva. On Friday, April 15, Al-Aqsa mosque was once again used as a pretext to bait Israel into a fight. Palestinians hurled stones at Jews celebrating Passover at the Western Wall. Israeli security forces restored order with stun grenades and tear gas. On April 21, after Israel's Iron Dome air defense system intercepted Hamas rockets, Israeli warplanes struck military targets in Gaza.

Conditions overseas are equally dire. In New York City on April 22, outside the Israeli consulate, one of a number of pro-Palestinian demonstrators savagely attacked a man carrying an Israeli flag. No surprise. Anti-Semitic attacks have doubled this year in New York. The United Kingdom has reported an alarming spike in anti-Semitic violence, too. German domestic intelligence officials fear that increased hostilities against Jews will only get worse. In France, a Jewish man was punched and kicked, and then killed by an oncoming tram when chased by a gang onto the tracks.

Brace yourselves, Jews. And consider wearing a flak jacket this week. Some extremist might be sporting a different kind of vest. Something very loud—and I'm not referring to color.  
(Jewish Journal Apr 27)

## Commentary...

**The Duplicity and Violence of Quds Day** By Thane Rosenbaum

What will you all be wearing for Quds Day this Friday? If you're Jewish, you should really be giving it some serious thought. I wouldn't take the day too lightly.

Those who observe the holiday are hoping for a bash, which is what Iran and its Palestinian proxies always desire—not so much a celebration of Islam's ties to Jerusalem, but more pointedly, the pummeling of Jews, wherever they might be found.

Beginning with the Islamic Revolution in 1979, Iran has hosted an annual worldwide hate-fest against Jews, celebrated on the last Friday of Ramadan. What a sad but revealing coda to the most pious month in the Islamic calendar—end your fast, and then get back to the joyous business of replenishing your rage against Israel. It's a special day each year where Muslims pledge themselves to the destruction of the Jewish people by first eliminating their state.

Think of Quds as a whirlwind of anti-Semitic, anti-Zionist propaganda—a Passion Play for Muslims, with Jews, naturally, typecast as villains. Ostensibly it's a day of solidarity with the Palestinians, but in actuality, it's just another excuse to burn flags and incite violence against Israel.

How do I know that despite all the hoopla, Quds is only peripheral to the Palestinians? Well, when Jordan truly "occupied" Jerusalem and the West Bank during Israel's first 19 years of existence (unlike Israel, Jordan had no lawful claims to the land), the rights of Palestinians were notably unmentioned in the Arab world. Statehood hardly ever came up. Muslims didn't demand that Jordan surrender the land to the Palestinian people.

It was only when Israel recaptured and reclaimed those territories in the Six-Day War that Arabs and Persians began to pay duplicitous lip service to Palestinian national aspirations.

Now, imagine if Luxembourg set aside a day for the exclusive purpose of hating France and its people—regardless of where they might live. The world would be outraged. Yet, when it comes to the unrelenting Arab hostility toward Jews, double standards are the order of the day, and the lowest of expectations are accepted. How can we not expect Arabs to incite violence against Jews at the conclusion of Ramadan?

Were it not for Israeli control over Jerusalem, would Muslims really need a day dedicated to this particular holy city? Yes, of course there is the Al-Aqsa Mosque on the Temple Mount, but in Islamic sacred scripture, Jerusalem isn't even a footnote. I'm not kidding. Jerusalem appears in the Bible 670 times. In the Koran—not once. If Jerusalem is that important to Muslims, how come it got left entirely out of Islam's holy text?

Moreover, if Quds was really about Palestinian self-determination, there would be less burning of Israeli and American flags, and far less trash talk. Nor are Palestinians on the minds of those who finance the holiday. In 2018, Iran's President Hassan Rouhani celebrated Quds by stating that "Israel can never feel that it is in a safe place." In 2012, Iran's then president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, said that "confronting the Zionist regime is a national and religious duty."

Worse still, the bloodthirstiness of Quds is not confined to the region. It is celebrated internationally, in over 80 countries, in New York, London, Paris, Stockholm, Berlin and Toronto. In London it attracts as many as 3,000 people. In Berlin, 1,600 protesters showed up in 2018. The United States can expect to see rallies in as many as 18 cities, especially on college campuses, accompanied by great fanfare.

Remember last year? Unlike other holidays, which were canceled during the pandemic, Al-Quds was deemed too essential to skip. The demonization of Israel is more infectious than the coronavirus. It got a boost, too, from tensions over the eastern Jerusalem neighborhood of

### Don't Believe the Spin: Biden Will Make a Deal with Iran

By Jonathan S. Tobin

Discerning the truth about diplomatic activity is often a matter of sifting out what's real from amid the surrounding noise of governmental spin. That means that at the moment, an accurate assessment of the possibility of a new American nuclear deal with Iran, as well as the state of U.S.-Israel relations may require one to ignore most of the headlines. If so, the optimism currently prevailing in Jerusalem about the prospects of the Biden administration betraying the security interests of Israel, the Arab states as well as the West could prove to be sadly deluded.

At the moment, Israeli Prime Minister Naftali Bennett and Foreign Minister Yair Lapid are feeling good about their strategy for dealing with President Joe Biden and his foreign-policy team, composed of Obama administration alumni and bent on another round of appeasement of Iran.

When they entered office last June, Bennett and Lapid were faced with what appeared to be a certainty that Biden's desperation would ensure Iran's eventual agreement to revive Obama's 2015 nuclear pact, albeit on terms far weaker than the already anemic ones in the original deal. Their response was not to sound the alarm about the impending betrayal of the security concerns of Israel, the Arab states and the West. Knowing that they had zero chance of persuading the Americans of the folly of their intentions, Bennett and Lapid reasoned that there was no point in starting a fight with Biden that they couldn't win. By keeping criticism of the administration largely muted, they avoided trouble with the White House.

At the worst, the Israeli leaders thought this relative silence would give them some credit with Biden, which they might cash in at a later date in the form of heightened security assistance. They might also have hoped that giving Biden a break on an issue of existential importance to Israel might make him less willing to challenge their government to make pointless concessions to the Palestinians that wouldn't advance peace, but might endanger the stability of their precarious coalition. And if Iran really seemed close to a bomb,

Bennett and Lapid knew they could always resort to the use of force. Not burning their bridges with Biden could give them a slightly better chance of getting American support or acquiescence for a strike with no certain chance of success.

While sensible in some respects, it was short-sighted in other ways.

By making no effort to inspire or assist Americans who are critical of administration policy and who might seek to place legal obstacles in its way, Bennett and Lapid undercut Israel's best friends. That strategy also lessened the chances that Republicans, who are odds-on favorites to control Congress next year and hope to regain the White House in 2024, could be counted on to reverse Biden's Iran appeasement policy as former President Donald Trump did when he took office. The lesson of former Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's impassioned opposition to Obama's deal, which led directly to a GOP turn against Iran, was lost on his successors.

Yet Bennett and Lapid have reason to think their position is about to be proven right. Iran has been far more obdurate than anyone thought it would be in the nuclear talks in Vienna. Rather than eagerly embracing Biden's weakness, Iran has exploited it ruthlessly by making demands that would hamstring American opposition to Iranian terrorism. Though a revived Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is already set to expire by the end of the decade, Tehran is determined to push Biden's team of appeasers even further than they imagined they'd have to go.

Still, Iran's request that the United States remove its Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) from the list of foreign terrorist groups wasn't so much an overreach as an embarrassment for Biden. Though American negotiators seemed prepared to accept even that outrageous demand as the price for a new deal, news of the concession leaked, generating more criticism, including even some from the Israeli government, than expected.

This apparent stalemate has led to a new confidence in Jerusalem that an Iran deal that was once seen as inevitable is now a longshot. At this point, Israeli government sources are telling reporters that they think the chances of a deal are currently "slim to none."

On top of that, the Israelis are also pointing to Biden's acceptance of Bennett's invitation to visit Israel as evidence that everything's coming up roses for them as far as the United States is concerned. Bennett avoided a breach with his country's most important ally. If the American appeasement initiative has truly been spurned by an Islamist regime not content to wait just a few years to get a nuclear weapon, then this development must cause a change in Washington's Middle East policy. Surely, even Biden's foreign-policy advisers must now see Tehran as an implacably hostile enemy that can't be reasoned into rejoining the international community. That ought to mean a return to a joint U.S.-Israel strategy on the issue, so as to ensure that the Jewish state and its Arab allies are not left isolated, as many thought was a certainty.

Yet Bennett and Lapid would be well-advised to put their self-congratulatory boasts on hold. The biggest mistake they could make is to underestimate the willingness of Biden and his band of former Obama staffers to do anything to get a new Iran deal.

Currently, the Americans are blaming their problems on Trump, whose decision to leave the Iran deal was, they say, a futile gesture that only brought Tehran closer to achieving its nuclear quest that Obama's agreement had at least put on hold. This is a false narrative. But it's also likely to provide a rationale for at least one more administration effort to ply Iran with concessions in the hope of rescuing the talks.

After all, on the very day that the Israeli government was spinning that nuclear talks being dead in the water, White House spokesperson Jen Psaki was telling reporters that the administration was deeply worried that Iran could be close to a nuclear breakout and a weapon in just a matter of weeks. After having been largely mum about the talks recently, Psaki's willingness to talk about this is a clear sign that the White House may be discouraged by the lack of progress in Vienna but has by no means given up.

As was the case in 2015 with Obama, Biden's justification for his Iran strategy is to claim the only choices are appeasement or war. In other words, Biden's people think their options are either to conclude a deal at any price or be faced with a nuclear Iran that they aren't

prepared to confront militarily.

So, even though the Israelis may think they've been saved by Iranian intransigence, the fear of a nuclear weapon that Obama already made more likely in 2015 may be enough to persuade Biden to give on the IRGC designated or any number of other inducements. That might tempt Iran to sign a new pact—that will, as the 2015 deal did, guarantee that Iran will eventually get a nuclear weapon—at the last minute, just when the Israelis thought they were out of the woods.

If that occurs, and it would be foolish to bet against it, the supposed benefits of Bennett and Lapid's defeatist approach may prove to have been illusions. Having done a deal with Iran, Biden will be unlikely to back a move against his new treaty partner or to reward a tottering Israeli coalition. And the Israeli government will have sent a message to its American friends not to care much about the greatest threat to the Jewish state's security. That's a disaster for Israel no matter how you look at it. (JNS Apr 27)

---

### **The Staging of the 'Jewish Attack' on Al-Aqsa** By Yifa Segal

In this recurring, unchanging script, every scene and every aspect of the performance is predictable, and so are its results. All the actors, those who know they are pawns, those who don't and those who pretend they don't, understand what to do and when to do it. The script creates the perfect charade and, with it, the perfect storm:

*Scene 1* - A seemingly desperate warning, perfectly timed, that the Jews are conspiring to burn, defile, "Judaize" and destroy the Al-Aqsa mosque is spread through Palestinian traditional and social media.

*Scene 2* - Palestinians and Israeli Arabs react with fear and outrage and begin organizing to defend their religion, identity and honor from this supposed Jewish attack.

*Scene 3* - Palestinian terror organizations, the Palestinian Authority and other dominant players call on every Muslim to join them, adding threats and incitement.

*Scene 4* - The Israelis try speaking to the Waqf and the King of Jordan, asking them to play a calming role in what is about to unfold. They pretend to listen.

*Scene 5* - Muslims start their ascent to Al-Aqsa, bringing with them heavy rocks, metal bars and anything that can be used as a weapon. They begin their siege, prepared to remain for some time.

*Scene 6* - Muslims start to riot, throwing their rocks at those passing by, those praying below, Israeli security forces and anyone else within their reach.

*Scene 7* - Israeli forces receive orders to refrain from "exacerbating" the situation. In other words, they are told to "take the hit" for as long as possible.

*Scene 8* - People are injured and massive damage and disruption ensue.

*Scene 9* - Israeli authorities turn to the Jordanians again, pleading for their assistance. They notify Jordan that if the situation continues, they will have no choice but to intervene and stop the violence.

*Scene 10* - The Jordanians release a statement condemning the Israelis for their actions, and present themselves as the guardians of Al-Aqsa and Muslim worshippers.

*Scene 11* - Now enters another reliable actor—the international media. The media discusses "Israeli crimes," "the occupation," "the infringement of freedom of religion" and violations of other human rights.

*Scene 12* - The Israelis, reluctantly, enter Al-Aqsa and suppress the violence.

*Scene 13* - The Jordanians, other Arab leaders and the media scream and shout, using every platform to condemn the Israelis for their intolerable behavior and severe violations of fundamental rights.

*Scene 14* - Terror organizations in Gaza fire several missiles at the civilian population of Israel.

*Scene 15* - Israel fires back at Hamas targets in the Gaza Strip.

*Scene 16* - The United Nations goes into action and convenes an emergency session to discuss Israel's "outrageous illegal actions."

*Scene 17* - Israel attempts to explain that it had no intention of doing anything to harm the mosque or the rights of its worshippers—quite the opposite. Israel has done everything in its power, including

suppressing the rights of non-Muslim worshipers, to avoid violence. It refrained from action as long as possible at the price of sacrificing its own public safety and order. It tried to cooperate with all parties to prevent any misunderstandings and deterioration of the situation. But no one wants to listen.

This year's charade has come to an end.

The radicals have achieved all they set out to achieve. Muslim hate was inflamed, as was the hate of many people worldwide who identify as "liberal." Israel took yet another beating both domestically and on the international stage. Mission accomplished.

And the show will likely attract an even bigger crowd and produce an even better result next time.

We must rethink our predetermined role in this charade. Perhaps it's time to find a role that better suits our agenda, rather than playing along with the recurring, unchanging script of our enemies.

Perhaps we can pre-empt this cynically orchestrated farce by taking a more proactive role. Let's outline the charade in Arabic, English and Hebrew before it happens. Let's speak to young Muslims in their language and expose the truth. Let's tell the media what is about to happen before it does. And let's stop counting on the help of the Jordanians. The Waqf is not there to protect anything except its anti-Israel agenda. It's time to write our own script. (JNS Apr 26)

*The writer was Chief of Staff of the Ambassador of Israel to the United States and former CEO of the International Legal Forum (ILF).*

---

### **Misunderstanding Christian Anti-Zionism** By Moshe Phillips

Jews should be as troubled by Christian Zionism as they are by Christian anti-Zionism, according to a prominent Jewish intellectual. I doubt he will find many in the Jewish community who concur with that kind of shallow thinking.

Dr. Yehuda Kurtzer, president of the Shalom Hartman Institute of North America, advanced his unconvincing argument in the online magazine Tablet on April 14. Recounting his experience as a guest at a recent Episcopal Church national event, Kurtzer described a scene that has been repeated at liberal Christian church conferences again and again for many years: lots of anti-Israel resolutions combined with plenty of self-righteous insistence that hatred of Israel is not anti-Semitic.

None of this is particularly new or interesting. What is interesting, however, is Kurtzer's attempt to "balance" Jewish resentment of Christian anti-Zionism by claiming that Christian Zionism is a big problem, too.

Just as we are troubled by the anti-Semitism of Christian anti-Zionists, "we should also be troubled by the philo-Semitic expressions [of] Christian Zionism," declares Kurtzer.

Those "troubling expressions" include "reading the Bible literally and then rendering service and kindness to contemporary Jews as a means of enacting divine promises ... often accompanied by political support and philanthropy for the State of Israel." Why, exactly, should that trouble us?

According to Kurtzer, the problem is theological. Many Christian Zionists are motivated to help Israel by their belief in "the imagined Jew of the evangelical prosperity gospel" (here he is referring to the Torah passage that states G-d will bless those who bless the Jews). He is uncomfortable with Christian Zionist beliefs that "displace actual Jews with a theological function that Jews are meant to serve."

But that's the point—it's just their belief. It doesn't have any negative practical consequences. If evangelicals want to believe that helping Jews is the prelude to a mass Jewish conversion at the end of days—as many evangelicals believe—why should that bother us? It's their belief, not ours. Their private thoughts don't affect us.

By contrast, the beliefs of Christian anti-Zionists affect us very much because Christian anti-Zionists put them into practice in very specific, harmful ways. Liberal churches promote the BDS movement against Israel; lobby against U.S. aid to Israel; and incite hatred by accusing Israel of apartheid, oppression and war crimes, as Kurtzer himself shows in his account of the recent Episcopal gathering.

Kurtzer's "both-sides-are-bad" argument may seem like evenhandedness, but it ultimately undermines Israel's cause. It softens justified criticism of Israel's enemies while unjustifiably chastising tens of millions of pro-Israel Christians. Consider that the organization

Christians United for Israel (CUFI) alone has more than 10 million members, according to its website.

Kurtzer makes the same mistake later in his article, in his characterization of the Arab-Israeli conflict. He calls the region "Israel-Palestine." He says "Israelis and Palestinians will continue to seek permanence and peace in their shared promised land." He refers to what he calls "the Palestinians' struggle for justice and reconciliation with their Jewish neighbors."

But it's not "Israel-Palestine." Throughout history, there has never been a state of "Palestine." The concept is nothing more than a device to injure and ultimately destroy Israel.

And the Palestinian Arabs are not "seeking peace" in a "shared promised land." They are seeking the destruction of Israel and the expulsion of the Jews from our land. Palestinian Arab leaders make these remarks every day in the Palestinian Authority's official news media, as well as in the school textbooks that the P.A. uses to educate the next generation. And, of course, the Hamas rulers of Gaza have no interest in peace at all.

The Palestinian Arabs are not "struggling for justice and reconciliation." They are struggling to achieve the injustice of eradicating Israel. Their idea of "reconciliation" is to return the Jews to their status in the Muslim world from the seventh century C.E. until 1948: stateless, persecuted, third-class dhimmis.

World Jewry should welcome the support of any Christians, regardless of their private theological beliefs. Showing gratitude for such support will not "make the Israeli-Palestinian conflict more of a holy war than it needs to be," as Kurtzer claims. It is a "holy war"—an "unholy war" would be more accurate—because the Palestinian Arabs and their millions of Muslim supporters see it that way. Fortunately, millions of Christians see the defense of Israel as their own holy war. (JNS Apr 25)

---

### **Where the 'Dual Loyalty' Accusation Actually Applies**

By Ruthie Blum

In a speech on Tuesday night, former U.S. Ambassador to Israel David Friedman refuted the anti-Semitic canard that Diaspora Jews who defend and champion the Jewish state are guilty of "dual loyalty."

Friedman, a proud Orthodox Jew whose four-year tenure was marked by the overseeing of and participation in a slew of pro-Israel moves, said that he'd been on the "receiving end" of that "shameful" accusation.

"Not only does support for Israel by American Jews not compromise or undermine support for our host country, but support for Israel is actually a quintessential American value," he said in the opening remarks of his lecture, delivered upon his receipt of the Guardian of Zion Award from Bar-Ilan University's Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies.

"Indeed," he went on, "the Bible, so much of which is predicated upon God's covenant to our forefathers to install, and then later to restore, the Jewish people in the land of Israel, is foundational to the principles upon which America was founded ... [and] Jews who support Israel stand for the very best of our American heritage and our American values."

These, he explained, are the "Judeo-Christian values upon which the United States was forged."

He was right, of course. Despite its location in the Middle East, Israel has more in common with the West. Though this is a great blessing, it poses a serious problem.

While the United States is engaged in an internecine battle for its political and cultural soul, Israel has external enemies bent on its annihilation. It's a testament to the vibrancy of the Jewish state that Israelis are often able to overlook this fact when emulating their American counterparts, many of whom—in Friedman's words—"chase the latest fad or half-baked theory, all driven to self-validate [their] poorest choices."

As poorly as the United States is faring from the pull of the so-called "progressives" away from what Friedman called the "principles of personal responsibility, equality, opportunity, generosity and accountability," it's nothing compared to the existential danger that such a tug presents to Israel.

This is not merely because Israelis can't afford to prioritize culture wars over concrete ones—such as the real and present perils of a nuclear Iran; terrorist attacks on the streets of Beersheva, Hadera, Bnei Brak and Tel Aviv; rockets from Gaza; and the current tsunami of Arab violence against Jews on the Temple Mount. It is also due to the watchful eyes of Israel's foes, who are happy to witness any signs of Western implosion.

Nor is Israel as a beacon in a sea of barbarism a Jewish issue, which is precisely why the "dual loyalty" allegation against members of the tribe in other countries is a complete lie. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of those Arab citizens of Israel who side with their country's mortal enemies.

Their allegiance isn't to the state in which they live and in whose parliament their representatives serve, but rather to various radical Muslim groups. Even many members of Israel's Knesset—not to mention its governing coalition—belong in this category.

Take Joint List Party leader Ayman Odeh, for instance. In a video message earlier this month that he delivered from the Old City of Jerusalem's Damascus Gate, a riot hotspot, Odeh called on Arab-Israeli youth not to serve in the police or other security forces, which "are humiliating our people, humiliating our families and humiliating all those who come to pray at the Al-Aqsa mosque."

He then urged those already enlisted in the "occupation forces" to "throw the weapons back in their face and to tell them that 'our place is not with you. We will not be part of the injustice and crime.'"

His reference to the "occupation" is an expression of loyalty with the peace-rejectionist Palestinians who mourn the nakba, the "catastrophe" of Israel's establishment in 1948. They make no bones about their intention to "liberate Palestine, from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea," a mantra about eliminating the Jewish state in its entirety.

"Dual loyalty," then, isn't exactly the problem of Odeh and his ilk; treason would be a better term for it.

Anti-Israel organizations abroad certainly fit the "dual-loyalty" bill, however. After all, protesters waving Palestinian flags in New York to promote "resistance by any means necessary" and a "globalization of the intifada" are letting their true affinity show. And it's not to Western civilization. (JNS Apr 24)

---

## Criticizing Israel has Become an Unbreakable Fetish

By Alan Baker

The penchant for criticizing Israel, whatever it may or may not do appears to have become a permanent fixation to the point of being an unbreakable obsession or fetish.

Whether such criticism relates to Israel's internal policies, or to governance of the territories, responses to terror attacks or whether it relates to situations with no apparent linkage to Israel, the obsessive necessity to find linkage to Israel inevitably emerges.

Such fixation is tailor-made to relate only to Israel. It does not occur with any other country. It singles-out Israel as the butt for criticism for any and every reason. It appears to be an ingrained component of the psyche of those who revel in it, and who seek out every opportunity to denigrate and delegitimize Israel.

No society or country is beyond rational criticism, Israel included. Israel's society and media, and domestic politics, are fitting examples of its openness and critical introspection.

However, oddly as it may seem, as a member of the world community, Israel has never benefited from the equality to which every other state is entitled.

Since its establishment and acceptance into the United Nations as a member of the international community, Israel has been denied one of the basic principles guaranteed to all states as set out in the opening articles of the Charter of the United Nations – the principle of sovereign equality.

This discrimination, which continues to the present, takes the form of exclusion from UN regional groupings, preventing Israel's right to submit its candidacy and candidates to main UN organs such as the Security Council or the International Court of Justice.

Since this has become an accepted norm of UN practice for over seventy years, it is no wonder that the fixation for singling-out Israel appears to be accepted internationally.

It is this that fuels the incessant fixation and obsession with Israel, including those political and media sources, domestic and international, entertaining a fixed agenda hostile to Israel's existence and engaged in delegitimizing Israel in international fora.

Such a chorus of obsessed critics also includes progressive and liberal elements within Western Jewish and Gentile communities, smitten with a sad penchant for self-hatred and a concomitant need for ingratiating themselves within their societies, with Israel as their convenient target.

Another obvious source of automatic criticism has existed from time immemorial and has permeated international society – antisemitism.

A major thrust of the anti-Israel fixation emanates from Palestinian elements that seek to delegitimize Israel in the international community.

This is evident in the abuse and manipulation of respected international bodies such as the International Criminal Court, the UN Human Rights Council, and the UN educational and cultural agency UNESCO.

As is widely known, the establishment of the ICC was inspired by the horrors of the Holocaust and other recent instances of grave atrocities and crimes of concern to the international community, with the purpose of ensuring that perpetrators would be duly punished. Jewish and Israeli international lawyers were among those who envisioned and worked toward the creation of such a court.

The Palestinians have attempted to hijack this court and turn it into their own backyard Israel-bashing tribunal, abusing and undermining its founding statute.

Similarly with the hijacking and irreparable abuse of the UN's Human Rights Council whose declared mission "to promote and protect human rights around the world."

Even the ostensibly professional UNESCO organization established to promote "collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms" has been similarly hijacked, preferring to vent an obsession with Israel through politically inspired resolutions denying the linkage of the Jewish people to its historic holy sites.

In the ongoing Russia-Ukraine war, Palestinians voice concern that the international community is overly immersed in the Russia-Ukraine war rather than pursuing Israel.

Their expressions of indignation seek to equate the low-intensity Israeli-Palestinian dispute with the high-intensity open warfare conducted by Russia against Ukraine, with its massive bombardment of civilians, use of illegal weaponry and millions of refugees.

This disproportionate attempt to invent a false equation is misplaced and malicious, indicative of the blindness caused by the obsession to criticize Israel.

Such obsession has also been voiced by a fringe US anti-Zionist organization Jewish Voice for Peace claiming that "The Israeli government is settling Jewish Ukrainian refugees on land it illegally occupies and prevents seven million Palestinian refugees from returning to..."

Similarly, American Jewish pro-Palestinian propagandist and apologist Peter Beinart, stated in the left-wing magazine Jewish Currents: Ukrainians, a mostly white and Christian people battling an American foe, are viewed as fully human, and thus entitled to fight for their freedom. Palestinians, a mostly nonwhite and non-Christian people battling an American ally, are not.

Similarly malicious comparisons have been echoed by former Human Rights Watch director Sarah Leah Whitson, by the president of the Foundation for Middle East Peace, Lara Friedman, the president of the Arab American Institute in Washington James Zogby and British Labor MP Julie Elliott.

The attempts to equate the immensity and lethality of the Russia-Ukraine war with the Palestinian issue are false, misguided and presumptuous. They misrepresent the nature, history and complexities of Israeli-Palestinian dispute, and ignore and undermine the ongoing Middle-East peace process sponsored and supported by the international community. (Jerusalem Post Apr 25)

---