

עש"ק פרשת אחרי מות-קדושים  
11 Iyar 5785  
May 9, 2025  
Issue number 1561



Jerusalem 6:45  
Toronto 8:12

## 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*

clarity of purpose to  
confront the very real  
threats that never went  
away. (JNS May 4)

### Jewish Anti-Zionists are a Tyranny of the Minority

By Yisrael Medad

## Commentary...

### Time to Recalibrate the Jewish Communal Mission

By Daniel Rosen

In the aftermath of Hamas-led terrorist attacks in Israel on Oct. 7, 2023, a seismic awakening has rippled through the Jewish world. The sense of shock, betrayal and disbelief wasn't just about the reactions that so many people had to the attacks on the streets and on social media in the United States. Nor was it just about the painful realization of what had been building beneath the surface for years.

Rather, it was also about the fact that while the organized Jewish community had been staunch supporters and advocates for so many liberal causes and groups, these same groups were among the most critical and silent in the face of the Oct. 7 butchery.

For years, major Jewish organizations operated under the assumption that antisemitism in America was largely a relic of the past. The idea that "antisemitism is dead" wasn't just a fringe opinion; it had become, for many in the upper ranks of organized Jewish communal institutions, a settled argument. And with that perceived victory, the mission shifted toward broader social-justice initiatives: intergroup bridge-building, support for other minority struggles and a well-meaning but often misapplied interpretation of tikkun olam, the Jewish calling to "repair the world."

And with that mindset shift, Jewish communal dollars also went elsewhere. According to a 2017 report by a post-doctoral fellow at Brandeis University, Hanna Shaul Bar Nissim, the vast majority of donations from Jewish federations, community foundations, wealthy Jewish individuals and other Jewish groups went to non-Jewish causes. As she wrote, "Philanthropy serving the Jewish community is becoming less dominant than charity serving other communities."

Yet by embracing progressive ideologies rooted in intersectionality, which divides society into binary roles of oppressor and oppressed, many of these Jewish organizations unwittingly allowed Jews and, by extension, Israel, to be categorized as the oppressors. In supporting causes that framed the world through race-based narratives, they empowered movements and rhetoric that increasingly cast Zionism as colonialism and Jews as privileged white elites.

The warning signs were there. While antisemitic incidents were being recorded, what was not considered was the cauldron of toxic attitudes that was festering and didn't have a way of expressing itself. In many ways, the aftermath of Oct. 7 provided the opportunity for a host of different people and groups to finally express what had been developing for quite some time.

Oct. 7, and the global reaction that followed, served as a brutal wake-up call. Jews across the spectrum, particularly those in progressive spaces, were shocked to see former allies either silent or openly antagonistic toward Israel and the Jewish people. The betrayal was clear: The solidarity was never truly reciprocal.

The good news is that the leaders of many Jewish institutions now appear to recognize the scope of the error. There is a growing movement, let's call it "the great recalibration," to recenter the Jewish mission. It starts with internal education: re-engaging synagogues, educating clergy, and providing young Jewish people with the historical and ideological tools to counter anti-Zionist narratives.

Truth to power needs to be spoken, not just in political spaces but in communities and congregations far and wide. It must be proclaimed clearly and confidently: Israel is not a colonizer. Zionism is not oppression; it is the national liberation movement of the Jewish people.

The challenges before the Jewish community were not created in a day and will not disappear in a day. The great miscalculation has been supplanted by the great recalibration. Through this experience, the Jewish people will emerge stronger, more united, and with a better

Many Jews, religiously observant or not, who have spent a Friday night at synagogue for a Shabbat evening service have observed the congregation, at the last verse of the "L'cha Dodi" liturgical song, turn around and ceremoniously bow to greet the Shabbat. Do they ask who composed that hymn, and what is the source of the bowing procedure?

If they did inquire, they would have learned that "L'cha Dodi" was written by Shlomo Halevi Alkabetz, who was born in the Ottoman city of Thessaloniki in the early 16th century. At the age of 30, he moved to Israel and resided in Safed, where he immersed himself in the group of Kabbalists in the town.

His inspiration came from the Talmud's Tractate Shabbat (119a). It is related that Rabbi Hanina and Rabbi Yannai, who lived in the third century C.E., would dress themselves in clean robes. Facing the setting sun in the West, Hanina would say, "Come, let us go and greet the Sabbath Queen." Rabbi Yanai would announce, "Enter, O bride! Enter, O bride!"

Following the service, those Jews most probably would have gone home or to a host's house. At the Shabbat meal, they very well may have sung the "Yah Ribbon Olam" hymn. Its verses were composed by Yisrael Najara. A scion of a Spanish Jewish family, he was born in Damascus in 1550 and, after 1580, moved to Gaza and served as the community's rabbi, as did his son, Moshe.

The 16th century is but one century of the 18 centuries during which, despite a loss of political and military sovereignty after two revolts against the Roman occupation, Jews sought to return to the Land of Israel from all over areas of dispersion and exile. They came to the Land of Israel, resided there, and created Jewish artifacts and commodities, influenced by the land and its history.

Jews immigrating to Israel is a principled characteristic of the national identity of the Jewish nation. Jews living there are engaged in religious and cultural Jewish and Hebraic activities, in addition to the normal economic, commercial and artistic undertakings that are the most elementary examples of a people.

The Jews desired to go to fulfill the commandments contained in the Torah and explained by the Talmud, and did so throughout the period of exile. As much as permitted by the foreign occupiers, they built houses, purchased land, planted crops, formed a business enterprise, copied religious scrolls, sat and learned the holy writs, and communicated with their fellow Jews in Europe, Asia, Africa and other far-flung locations.

Their identity as Jews centered on the accomplishments of their peoplehood generated by their beliefs, language, literature and acknowledgement that their homeland is Eretz Yisrael. Their rabbinic literature never ignored the commandments connected to the land, as well as the obligation to ascend to it and live in it. The land was at the Jews' core, and Jews knew that they would return. It was all a question of how—by Messiah or by human effort, by a Shabtai Zvi in Turkey in 1648 or a Menachem Mendel in Vitebsk in 1777.

With the development of the idea of secularism among Jews, the Return to Zion became an undesired goal. The Enlightenment further eroded the national underpinnings of the Jews' identity. The appearance of Reform Judaism further denied Judaism's national element as in 1869, when Chicago Rabbi Bernhard Felsenthal protested schemes to resettle the Land of Israel and supported the resolution of the Philadelphia Conference of Reform Rabbis, which declared: "The Messianic goal of Israel is not the restoration of the old Jewish state under a descendant of David, involving a second separation from the nations of the earth, but the union of all men as the children of God."

Not unremarkably (as we are dealing with Jews), in 1907, that same Rabbi Felsenthal expressed his conviction that "Zionism alone will be the savior of our nation and its religion, and save it from death and disappearance." At that same time, prominent Chassidic rebbes

and other traditionalists saw in the recently established Zionist organization a threat to the spiritual and religious aspects of Judaism, leading to what could be referred to as the Satmar/Neturei Karta version of anti-Zionism. Even the American Council for Judaism is making a comeback, as is the Bundist version.

Despite the prominence they receive—whether on the opinion pages of *The New York Times*, electronic and digital-media platforms, or the assistance they receive from Hollywood stars and academic self-professed experts—they are a minority among the Jewish people. Unfortunately, their behavior is tyrannical. But like others before them, their influence will wane, and they will fade away. (JNS May 7)

---

### **Stop Following the Leaders** By Liz Wagner

The Jewish Council for Public Affairs (JCPA) recently brought together 10 organizations representing a “broad swath of mainstream American Jewry, including three of the four religious denominations. Together, they put out a statement urging people to reject what they described as the Trump administration’s “false choice between confronting antisemitism and upholding democracy.”

The document is a glaring example of misdirection, accusing the administration of using “the guise of fighting antisemitism to justify stripping students of due process rights when they face arrest and/or deportation, as well as to threaten billions in academic research and education funding.”

It goes on to claim that students are “being punished for their constitutionally protected speech,” as if inciting hatred and violence against Jews and calling for revolution in the United States is protected speech for foreign students on visas and green-card holders disrupting life on college campuses. Orthodox leaders wisely declined to sign on, as did the Jewish Federations of North America. The Anti-Defamation League did not sign the letter but then came out in support of it, presumably after (mis)judging it to be a worthy declaration, in the days following its release.

Jews recently observed Yom Hashoah. No doubt many of these leaders repeated “Never Again” in their observance remarks, but it is déjà vu all over again, folks. Once more, Jews are in the crosshairs of a major political movement organized against us. Incredibly, many of our national Jewish leaders are again co-opted by Democratic Party politics, as happened during the Holocaust, and they are foolishly sabotaging efforts to stop today’s global assault on Jews.

To understand the depth of their depravity in repeating these mistakes, I urge you to watch the documentary film “Against the Tide” about the American Jews during the years of the Holocaust and how one young activist, Peter Bergson (real name Hillel Kook), challenged Jewish communal organizations to fight for the rescue of European Jewry.

For five decades, the Jewish left has nudged Jewish attention away from fierce support for Israel to maintain an ethereal place for Jews within leftist coalitions, even as hostility to Israel and Jews became the norm. It is time for Jews to wholeheartedly reject this foolishness.

There’s nothing wrong with Jews focusing on secular issues. The problem is that groups like the JCPA and others are trying to re-engineer Jewish identity itself by claiming that Jews don’t need to ferociously defend Israel or ourselves. It seems like their twisted message is that the best way to be Jewish is to prioritize progressive politics. These days, that includes defending advocates of a genocidal Arab and Muslim cause from the Middle East called “Palestine.” This is insane.

Jews cannot secure our homeland in Israel or our place in American society by crafting an identity that denies Jewish history and indigenous rights in the Arab- and Muslim-dominated Middle East. We cannot surrender our Jewish identity and our role in America to an identity-obsessed left that refuses to acknowledge 4,000 years of Jewish history.

Those pushing this narrative are the same people who, even after the Hamas-led terrorist attacks in southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023, continue to talk about a “two-state solution” while whitewashing the genocidal culture in Gaza and the territories controlled by the Palestinian Authority. They never address the anti-Americanism behind anti-Israel politics because to do so would get them booted from circles on the left. They are incapable of developing serious counter-offensives to criticism of Israel and the Jewish people because

they refuse to assert Jewish power in defiance of the progressives’ anti-Jewish politics. They can’t imagine such defiance because they forgot, if they ever knew, that it was the Jews and not the progressives who brought ideas like social justice and social responsibility into the world. That it is the Jews and not the progressive left that know how best to make these ideals work.

The JCPA-led coalition that put out the statement against the government’s actions to fight antisemitism on campus is telling Jews not to believe our eyes when we see President Donald Trump and his administration do more to protect Jews than any American president since George Washington. They want Jews to criminalize Trump administration efforts to fight antisemitism and, instead, focus on protecting those who mean to harm Jews and other Americans.

Not so long ago, Jews joined with members of black churches to demand that the civil rights of all Americans be protected. Today, the Trump administration, Christians of all races and reform-minded Muslims are standing together to demand that the civil rights of Jews, now under severe attack, be protected. It’s time to stop following Jewish “leaders” who tell you to reject that help. To save democracy, we must first save the Jews. (JNS May 7)

---

### **Israel and the Future of Civilization** By Matthew Schultz

When a new Douglas Murray book comes out, I always opt for the audiobook. His formidable intellect, cutting wit and plummy English accent—tinged with just the right amount of disdain—combine for a singularly enjoyable listening experience.

But in his latest book, “On Democracies and Death Cults: Israel and the Future of Civilization,” Murray sounds different than he used to. His speech is slower and more deliberate—lacking some of the verve and archness of his previous recordings. Something in Murray has changed.

I noticed it again when listening to the viral debate between Murray and anti-Israel comedian Dave Smith on Joe Rogan’s podcast. I wanted Murray to eviscerate Smith, and indeed there were many opportunities for him to do so. Smith displayed obtuseness about the conflict and made bizarre ahistorical comments about Israel’s first prime minister. An energetic debater who knows his stuff—as Murray clearly does—should have been able to win this one handily.

Instead, Murray seemed unable to do much of anything other than point out that Smith had never “been there”—that, despite all his posturing, he’d never set foot in Israel or the Palestinian territories. It was a fair point, but one that didn’t land with Rogan’s audience. The moment felt strangely flat—underwhelming from a man known for his rhetorical precision.

To understand what happened on that episode of Rogan, and to understand why Murray sounds different these days, one must read the new book to its conclusion. “On Democracies and Death Cults” is a work of reportage. Murray’s reporting began on Oct. 7, 2023, when he woke up—as we all did—to news of Hamas’s massacres unfolding in southern Israel. The next day, he saw the first vigorous eruptions of anti-Israel sentiment that would soon engulf much of the country, and he began documenting and trying to understand.

“Hundreds of people were gathered in Times Square. ... Some came with homemade signs. One headscarf-covered woman was smiling gleefully, waving a sign that said ‘Zionist nightmares. 10/6/73 Egyptians. 10/7/23 Palestinians. #Long Live Intifada.’ As I photographed her with my phone she punched the air and screamed with joy.”

A significant portion of the book explores this baffling global response to Israel’s war: the reflexive blame, the charges of genocide, the legal campaigns in international courts and the rise of a global protest movement that laid bare just how fully Western liberals have aligned themselves with Islamist militant groups.

Many people have been confused by the sight of college students and various blue-haired progressives donning keffiyehs and chanting Hamas slogans, but for Murray, who has spent years reporting on anti-Western ideologies within the American and British left, this is the culmination of processes that have been going on for years.

He dissects phenomena like “Queers for Palestine” with more insight than perhaps anyone else. While the group is often dismissed with mockery—likened to “Chickens for KFC”—Murray rightly

understands that the alliance between the radical left and Islamist movements is not incoherent, but ideologically consistent.

“The fact that ... Western organizations such as ‘Queers for Palestine’ can support groups that would kill them is often described as ‘cognitive dissonance,’ but that is not accurate. Such groups are not ‘confused.’ They are simply betraying a completely different agenda. For them the most important thing is to support the revolutionary left and the overthrow of Western liberal democracy. Supporting armed Islamic movements that rape and murder and execute is a necessary condition to achieve this goal.”

Understanding this ideological alignment is one thing. Witnessing its consequences firsthand is another.

Shortly after Oct. 7, in London, Murray attended a private screening for journalists of the video footage documenting the atrocities of that day. “I would see many such videos,” he writes, “from people who had been at the Nova party, from relatives who showed me the last moments in the lives of their loved ones, and from the organizations like Hatzalah whose brave Jewish, Muslim, and Druze volunteers had all driven toward the disaster that day. But none of it compared with the impact of that first, bludgeoning viewing of portions of the massacre.”

“It takes a lot to silence a roomful of British journalists,” Murray continues, “but three-quarters of an hour of this did it. I left with an old friend of mine from the British media, a journalist in his 70s who has seen his share of war. It took a long while for either of us to find any words as we walked along the gray, leaf-covered streets of London. Eventually he did manage to say something. ‘Bastards,’ he said. ‘Bastards,’ I agreed.”

Soon after, Murray traveled to Israel. Though not Jewish himself, he has long been a defender of Israel and has made many trips to the region to report on the conflict.

Once there, Murray spoke to soldiers, doctors and the families of the hostages. He met with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and nearly every other member of Israel’s government. He even visited a prison and sat down across from one of the Oct. 7 terrorists himself. “I suppose that you look at people like this in the hope that you might see something in them. What is it? Remorse? Evil? I spent hours in the prison that day, and although I saw people I knew from the atrocity videos, there was nothing to learn from them. They had decided to live their lives with one ambition — to take away life.”

Murray visited the rocket-pounded towns of Israel’s north and the burnt-out kibbutzim of the south. He walked through Hamas tunnels and traversed the ruined streets of Rafah. He even sat in the chair where Yahya Sinwar took his last breath and tried to imagine what the terrorist mastermind could have possibly been thinking in his final moments. In other words, he was there, bearing witness to acts of incredible bravery and heroism as well as stomach-turning displays of barbarity and callousness.

And this is why, on Joe Rogan’s show, all he could say to Dave Smith was “You’ve never been there,” which was an infinitely more stinging indictment than the Wikipedia-educated comedian could grasp.

Bearing witness is not easy. I have assiduously avoided seeing any video footage of Hamas’s massacres. To even read the details of that day is incredibly difficult, and as I worked my way through Murray’s book, I was surprised by the visceral effect that it had on me—the way that a year-and-a-half’s worth of pain and fear and outrage swelled up in me as I read.

But something else swelled in me too—pride. At a time when even large parts of the Jewish community look at Israel and respond with shame, condemnation and distance, Murray sees something else entirely. He sees the best in the Israeli people—and he documents it.

For instance, Murray tells the story of Ben Shimoni. On Oct. 7, “Ben managed to escape the party, taking four other terrified partygoers with him in his car. He drove them to safety in Beersheba, 30 minutes away. Then he headed back to the site of the party. On that trip he managed to save another group of five young people and also took them to safety. Each time, his passengers begged him not to go back into the firefight. But he had a mission. On the third attempt, carrying three more survivors in his car, the terrorists caught him.”

This is not to say that Murray has no harsh words for the Jewish state. But unlike those who criticize Israel for defending itself, Murray’s critique is that Israel hasn’t defended itself enough. “How,”

he asks again and again, even posing the question to Netanyahu, “did this happen?” Who dropped the ball? And why? And how can it be assured that it never happens again?

At the book’s end, Murray reflects on the very shift in tone I had picked up on in his delivery. “Throughout this year of war I often felt this strange disjunct,” he writes. “Friends and family occasionally remarked that I had changed. Readers sometimes noticed it too.

“And as the year went on readers started noting to me that I seemed to have lost some of my usual pessimism. I noticed it myself, and there was a reason for it: I was seeing answered a question that had always troubled me. What we would do if we came to a time of trial like our forebears did?”

Something Murray returns to throughout the book is the gulf “between the realm of war and the realm of peace.” Living between these realms as a journalist, Murray comes to a startling realization. War, for all of its terrible tragedy, can have a clarifying effect—making humans understand at once what is truly important in life.

It’s just as true that peace can be deranging. On his trips to America and Britain, Murray observed fractious, materialist, petty societies. “Is this really the highest moment of human achievement and peace, I wondered.”

In Israel, on the other hand, embattled by “death cults” on all sides, he saw a people that had been forced to understand what life, commitment, service, community and citizenship were really about.

Jewish-American historian Salo Baron coined the idea of “the lachrymose conception of Jewish history,” the idea that Jewish history has been nothing but a series of unfolding tragedies. This was something Baron railed against, pointing out that the Jews had also known moments of prosperity and success throughout the centuries.

Since Oct. 7, this “lachrymose” way of looking at things has reared its head. Aside from the scale of the tragedy itself, there is the ongoing catastrophe of the hostages, 24 of whom are still waiting to be rescued from Hamas captivity. On top of that, there are ongoing security threats to Israel, rising antisemitism around the world, and an anti-Zionist movement that continues to grow in size and legitimacy.

For many Jews, it feels that the walls are closing in, that there is more to fear than to celebrate, that there are no blessings to count.

Douglas Murray doesn’t flinch from these harsh realities. And yet, he emerges from it all not broken, but transformed—uplifted by what he saw in Israel, and more confident in its future than in that of his own homelands, Britain and the United States.

This, more than anything, is why you should read this book. Murray reminds us of what is still worth celebrating, still worth taking pride in, still worth believing in.

We can celebrate the fact that we have endured.

We can take pride in how we’ve met the challenges of this past year—with resilience, clarity, and courage.

And we can trust the people of Israel. On Oct. 7, the army failed and the government failed—but the people rose. Confronted with a death cult, they chose life. (Jewish Journal May 7)

---

## **Benjamin Netanyahu vs. Edward Said: The Global War Over Woke Ideas** By Gadi Taub

The war in Gaza has significance far beyond its regional military aspects. It has come to play a major role in the global war of ideas, a crucial front in the worldwide struggle against woke ideology.

Its outcome will have significance for the future of liberal democracy everywhere. Because the war is a test case for one of the most crucial questions of our time: Can the West regain enough self-confidence to defend its own values?

This is what lends urgency to the battle over the framing of the war, which began almost as soon as the war did. The woke did not have to wait until the charred, mutilated and desecrated bodies of the Jewish victims cooled down in order to know which party was in the wrong.

Western “progressive” intellectuals began, almost immediately, to suggest that “more context” was needed. And the “context” was, predictably, “the occupation”—never mind that Gaza has not been under Israeli rule since 2005. Trained in post-colonial studies and versed in identity politics, the woke possesses hostility to Zionism that is more than merely an item on their cancel list. It is a litmus test by which they decide who is “on the right side of history.”

The Palestinians are, in this view, native people of color and the Jews are European whites who colonized Palestinian lands. All other details must fit into this moral mold.

With the dispossession of Native Americans now relegated to the past, slavery extinct in the West and European rule gone from the Far and Middle East, only Zionism is left to embody Western sins. Israel is, according to the woke, a rearguard of Western colonialism and 19th century nationalism, the last vestige of retrograde Western ideologies.

Demanding its destruction is therefore both a badge of morality and a ritual of atonement. It is as if Zionism is, for the woke, a voodoo doll: By stabbing it, one demonstrates that he has transcended Western sins. Having thus shed their bad old self, Western woke elites are ready to devote themselves to making amends to the former victims of their civilization, by turning against it and against that which symbolizes its sinful past.

The woke are, in fact, attempting to exonerate themselves for the antisemitism of the past, by perpetuating antisemitism in the present, now in the guise of anti-Zionism. The sins of the Nazis will be atoned by calling the Zionists Nazis.

In this cultural context, it should be clear why the battle over the framing of the war is not just about Israel's right to defend itself against Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran. It's about Israel right to exist. It's also about the very legitimacy of Zionism.

This means that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's insistence on the moral justification of the war is also a demand to scrap the whole map by which Western "progressive" elites make sense of the world—not least their own domestic politics. If Zionism is, for the woke, the contemporary paradigmatic example of Western sins, then legitimizing it means rejecting the idea that Western sins can explain all evils that befell the world. Which in turn means collapsing the whole of the woke edifice.

For Netanyahu, far from being a relic of the bad old colonial past, Israel is a trailblazer, pointing the way to a safer future. It is the front line of Western civilization in its war against barbarism. It is the vanguard now rushing to defend civilization's boundaries where they were violently breached.

"If you remember one thing from this speech, remember this," Netanyahu said in July 2024 to a joint session of the U.S. Congress. "Our enemies are your enemies; our fight is your fight; and our victory will be your victory."

He reiterated similar themes in his address to the U.S. General Assembly in October, when he spoke of the "savagely murderers" who are out to destroy "our common civilization."

In Congress, Netanyahu also pointed out the collaboration between the West's external enemies and its internal woke detractors.

"I have a message for these protesters," he said, referring to the demonstrators against his presence on Capitol Hill, carrying "Gays for Gaza" placards. "When the tyrants of Tehran, who hang gays from cranes and murder women for not covering their hair are praising, promoting and funding you, you have officially become Iran's useful idiots."

Wokeism is an autoimmune disease. It attacks our ability to defend our values. Its moral relativism first asserts the equality of all cultures, then lets anti-western values into its midst through the gateway of boundless tolerance. Finally, it inverts morality by leveraging Western guilt in order to forbid any criticism of racist, misogynist, anti-gay, antisemitic and anti-Western ideologies—so long as these come from groups designated as victims of the West.

The damage caused by this moral inversion is the same everywhere. It is what led British authorities to turn a blind eye to grooming gangs in the name of "community relations;" it is what led students to support the genocide of Jews in the name of "anti-racism;" it is what led courts to send rapists to women's jails; and what authorized the sterilization of children in the name of "gender affirmation."

It is also what led the International Court of Justice in The Hague to argue that Israel, not Hamas, should be tried for genocide. It reached the height of absurdity with Judith Butler, the feminist oracle, defending the sadistic barbarian rape and mutilation of Jewish women as "armed resistance."

This inversion is, indeed, omnipresent in the left: The Biden administration's instinctive response to the massacre of Jews on Oct. 7, 2023 was to set up a taskforce for combating "Islamophobia."

Netanyahu's mission is not, of course, to argue the fine points of queer theory or to point out the contradictions in the late Palestinian-American activist professor Edward Said's teachings. But his instinct for calling out cultural and moral relativism goes right to the heart of the problem.

"This is not a clash of civilizations," he told Congress, alluding to Samuel Huntington's popular book. "It's a clash between barbarism and civilization. It's a clash between those who glorify death and those who sanctify life."

Framing the war in this way and calling barbarism by name, Netanyahu set out to overthrow a worldview, not just an opinion. His call was for the restoration of our immune systems, so that we may regain moral clarity and be able to tell right from wrong. His speech was the virtual opposite of the worldview expounded in Cairo on June 4, 2009 by Said's most influential disciple—Barack Hussein Obama.

Obama's own disciples were still at the helm when Netanyahu spoke to Congress. He could not say this explicitly, but he must have been fully aware that he was asking the world's greatest superpowers to jettison Obama's woke moral compass and reverse course. It thus fell to the leader of a small country to call America, and the West as a whole, to its senses.

"For the forces of civilization to triumph, America and Israel must stand together," he said, adding Ronald Reagan's famous Cold War quip: "Because when we stand together, something very simple happens—we win, they lose."

Despite the standing ovation he received from senators and House representatives, Netanyahu was facing an administration that refused to rise to the challenge, or even to call evil by name. It was not only trying to appease the barbarians; it was even refusing to call them that.

It is high time we bring back truth to our language. The word "barbarism" must be returned to our lexicon if we are to understand the meaning of the war in the Middle East as well as almost every central aspect of politics—domestic and foreign—in every Western democracy.

The question isn't whether the term does or does not give us a clue as to the alleged residual racism of those who use it. It is not a misnomer designed to excuse Western domination over innocent victims. It is an accurate, truthful description of powerful enemies who mean it when they say they are out to destroy Western civilization.

It fell to Israel not only to fight these barbarians for its own survival, but also to wake the West up from its woke dreams, and exhort it to return to itself. We Israelis are not the unpleasant remnant of your guilty past. We are the key to your future survival. That was the deeper meaning of Netanyahu's speech.

Not all values are created equal. We will not be able to defend ours if we continue to use Obama-era sanitized language and talk of "radical extremism," instead of calling the terrorists of Hamas, the Pakistani grooming gangs in Britain, the Muslim murderers of Charlie Hebdo journalists in France or the assassin of gay director Theo Van Gogh in Holland by the name that describes them truthfully: jihadi barbarians. Foes of humanism. Enemies of liberalism and democracy.

This is not all theory. Israel is now fighting not only against a military enemy. It is also waging a simultaneous culture war against a constellation of lopsided "human rights" organizations, think tanks and NGOs, biased international tribunals, woke newspapers, "progressive" media outlets and social-media platforms, corrupt universities and peace processors who are trying to tie our hands.

We need to openly defy them. We need to go on the offensive and destroy their moral credibility. Above all, we need to win on the battlefield despite their best efforts to stop us, because it is crucial not only for Israel's existence. It is also essential to demonstrate that democracies can defend themselves. That they will not let their moralizing elites turn their own values against them, demanding in effect surrender to the barbarians.

We cannot desert our values by pretending to adhere to them more scrupulously. Israel must now prove that the West can be diverted from the path of cultural suicide.

We are now the West's boots on the ground, in the cultural war as well. (JNS May 4)