

עש"ק פרשת בהר-בחוקות
25 Iyar 5785
May 23, 2025
Issue number 1563



Jerusalem 6:55
Toronto 8:27

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*

Commentary...

Britain, France and Canada's Hamas Lifeline is a Dangerous Blunder

By Richard Kemp

Operation Gideon's Chariots aims to deliver the final blow to Hamas and recent strikes have finished off several senior terrorists. Ordinary Gazans are increasingly out on the streets demanding Hamas end the conflict that has brought such disaster on them. Hamas, perhaps sensing its impending demise, is back at the negotiating table.

At this critical moment, with a masterstroke of ill judgement, Britain, France and Canada reach into murky waters that they do not understand and hold out a hand to pull Hamas back to the surface. Like tight-lipped and disapproving school mistresses they "strongly oppose the expansion of Israel's military operations".

Their joint statement demanding Israel halt its operations in Gaza is nothing less than a call for Israel to surrender: cease operations, withdraw forces, leave Hamas to rebuild and get ready for another 7th October. That is the meaning of their reproachful statement.

They call the IDF's renewed offensive "disproportionate". It is nothing of the kind. Israel is fighting a defensive war to protect its population from further attacks. That requires the destruction of Hamas's military capabilities and the removal of it and its kind from controlling terrain that would again threaten Israel if given half a chance. The Allies in the Second World War used overwhelming force to destroy Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. Do Starmer, Macron and Carney believe that was a "disproportionate" way to defend our freedom? Or is it only the Jewish state that can never be allowed to win?

They snidely refer to "the Netanyahu government's" egregious actions. We see exactly what they are doing here. It has become fashionable among some supporters of Israel, to disavow Netanyahu himself in order to burnish their oh-so-virtuous credentials ("while still standing up for Israel"). The kind of language used in this statement is usually reserved for dictatorships, like "the Putin regime". Yet Netanyahu is the democratically elected leader of his country and his war policies have the support of the overwhelming majority of Israelis.

Yes, the leaders of the UK, France and Canada have tacked on the token request that Hamas release the hostages. I have been involved in drafting this sort of statement in the past and it is blatantly obvious that this has been added as an afterthought to show "balance". A bit like the International Criminal Court issuing a token arrest warrant for a deceased Hamas terrorist alongside their outrageous warrants for Israel government ministers.

The statement warns Israel is at risk of breaching International Humanitarian Law by blocking aid from entering Gaza. It does not. The obligation under the 4th Geneva Convention to allow aid to the enemy civilian population is explicitly exempted if there is a risk that the aid will be diverted to enemy fighting forces. It is well known that Hamas has been hijacking aid for its own purposes since the war began. Yet none of these three upstanding countries has seen fit to get behind the new US-Israeli plan to get aid in under arrangements designed to prevent its diversion for terrorist purposes.

Of course no statement by Britain, France or Canada would be complete without the standard litany of delusions about supposedly illegal settlements and a "two state solution". Can serious politicians really believe another two state solution is possible in the aftermath of the horrifically failed two state solution experiment in Gaza? Certainly Israeli support for such a thing could only — if ever — follow the total crushing of Hamas with the message that would send to any gangsters contemplating a similar endeavour. But that outcome is exactly what these three countries oppose.

Along similar lines, Starmer, Macron and Carney don't seem to understand the consequences for their own countries of the survival of Hamas. They each have their ever-growing jihadist problems. Last week alone in Britain a number of Iranian men were arrested while plotting terrorist attacks in the UK. An Israeli defeat by Hamas — which is what they are advocating — could only inspire and encourage

global jihadists.

Most damning of all, this statement has been welcomed by Hamas itself. Surely even these three amigos can comprehend that that alone means you're on the wrong side?

But this joint statement is not only ill-judged; it is also extremely dangerous. It strengthens Hamas, it gives them hope at a time when that commodity is ebbing fast. It could lead to them digging in their heels to inflict even greater bloodshed on Israeli soldiers as well as their own people. If these were serious political leaders they would have confined their threats against an ally at war to the realms of secret diplomacy. But no, they must indulge in public virtue signalling. Appease the Jew hating mobs that paraded the streets of their capitals only last weekend and damn the consequences.

The statement concludes with the dark threat of recognising a Palestinian state. As Prime Minister Netanyahu pointed out in his response, the leaders in London, Ottawa and Paris are offering a huge prize for the genocidal attack on Israel on October 7th while inviting more such atrocities".

If Starmer, Macron and Carney actually wanted to make a real contribution to peace in the region they would have told Hamas to release the hostages and lay down their arms. That above all is needed to save lives in Gaza and begin the process of rebuilding a decent life for the civilian population. But that would be too much to expect from bewildered leaders who cannot even defend their own borders or protect their own population from ever-increasing threats against them. (Ynet May 20)

The writer is a former UK Armed Forces commander.

Domestic Terror is the Inevitable Next Step for Hamas Sympathizers

By Jonathan S. Tobin

For the past 19 months, angry mobs have taken over college campuses and the streets of major American cities. These demonstrations, tent encampments and building takeovers have not just been expressions of opposition to Israel's efforts to eradicate the Hamas terrorists who led the Palestinian Arab assault on southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023. They have also often been indicative of the protesters' support for Hamas and the embrace of terrorist goals, as well as their antisemitism—something that was made obvious by the way they have targeted Jews during the course of their "activism."

Yet rather than being isolated and widely condemned, these pro-Hamas activists and demonstrators have been cheered by many in the media and even rationalized by former President Joe Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris, as well as their party's left-wing leaders, who spoke of them as idealists who "deserved to be heard" and validated, even if they disagreed with some of what they were saying.

In doing so, they were ignoring the warning signs that the pro-Hamas movement was more than just mainstreaming Jew-hatred in discourse. As has been the case throughout history, those who speak of their support for terrorism elsewhere often wind up committing it at home.

After the tragic murder on Wednesday night of two young Israeli embassy staffers outside an American Jewish Committee event at the Capital Jewish Museum in Washington, D.C., it's obvious that this is also the case with those who embraced the war against Israel's existence.

There is much we don't yet know about the accused murderer, who was apprehended at the scene. But the targeting of Israelis at a Jewish site as well as the fact that police say the assailant shouted "Free, free Palestine"—the same expression heard at countless pro-Hamas and anti-Israel rallies since Oct. 7—leads to an inevitable conclusion.

It didn't take long for words to turn into action—from being willing to demonize Israelis, falsely accuse them of "genocide" or "apartheid," and rationalize or even support the barbarous murderers, rapists and kidnappers of Hamas, and then condoning or rationalizing violence against Jews and Israelis on American soil.

We will be told in the coming days that the bloodshed in Washington has nothing to do with "criticism" of Israel or its policies.

There will be distinctions made between what will be described

as “mostly peaceful” pro-Hamas demonstrations and the murder. The groups that have organized those protests and engaged in antisemitic acts of intimidation, and even violence, will likely condemn the murder as they continue to smear Israel and its supporters. And, as has been the case with those who oppose the Trump administration’s efforts to combat antisemitism on college campuses and to deport those foreign students who have violated the terms of their visas and green cards by engaging in illegal activities, we will be told that the nation’s priority should be to defend the free speech of Hamas supporters and antisemites. Concern for the rights and welfare of these Israel-haters will be voiced, especially by left-wing Jewish groups.

But it should be remembered that while the right to peaceful and legal protests should be defended, the violent nature of much of what is now termed “pro-Palestine” activism is no accident. The same is true for the antisemitism that is never far from the surface whenever these supporters of terror speak or gather.

The chants of “Free, free Palestine” have nothing to do with the freedom of people in Gaza who were not “occupied” when they attacked Israeli communities and committed unspeakable atrocities on Oct. 7. They are not about a two-state solution to the conflict with Israel that the Palestinians have made clear time and again they do not want. It’s a cry for the replacement of the State of Israel by a Palestinian Arab state in which Jews would no longer have the ability to defend themselves.

The chants of “From the river to the sea” are, regardless of whether those shouting it can identify either body of water, a demand for the eradication of Israel and the genocide or expulsion of the 7.2 million Jews who live there.

Those shouting “Globalize the intifada!” have not been speaking about some idealized protest movement spreading from the Gaza Strip to Europe and the United States. It’s a slogan rooted in a belief of the right for those who hate Israel to carry Hamas’s campaign of anti-Jewish violence around the world. That means in every town, city, state or country where Jews reside.

The proof that this “pro-Palestinian” activism had nothing to do with support for human rights and peace was made abundantly clear in the aftermath of Oct. 7. The atrocities carried out during Black Shabbat—during which 1,200 Israeli men, women and children were slaughtered, and 251 people were kidnapped and dragged back into Gaza to suffer further torments—did not give Hamas’s supporters pause. They didn’t wait for Israel to begin its military campaign three weeks later to ensure that these crimes would never again happen to condemn the Jewish state and its citizens as having gotten exactly what they deserved.

This has nothing to do with wanting a better life for Palestinian Arabs, since anyone who really wished them well would demand that they be freed from the control of Hamas. Instead, over the course of the following 19 months, this movement continued to support the cause of Israel’s destruction and the genocidal goals of the Palestinians.

The legitimization of this pro-Hamas movement was enabled by the political cowardice as well as a willingness of many in the Democratic Party to buy into the toxic myths of ideologies like critical race theory, intersectionality and settler-colonialism that falsely claim that Jews and Israelis are “white” oppressors who must be resisted and defeated.

It has been abetted by corporate news media that have been acting as Hamas’s stenographers, accepting bogus, exaggerated figures of Palestinian casualties, as well as false claims of famine in Gaza, such as the recently debunked claims of CNN and NBC News that amount to blood libels. Mainstreaming these lies about Israeli indiscriminately killing Palestinians—when, in fact, the Israel Defense Forces takes more care to avoid civilian casualties than any other army in modern history—or carrying out a mythical “genocide” has consequences.

Those who falsely label Jews as mass murderers intent on killing all Palestinians, when in fact it is Hamas and other Arab groups that seek the genocide of the Jews, are not merely making journalistic errors or engaging in hyperbole. They are legitimizing those who believe that any and all tactics—“by any means necessary”—are justified in fighting and killing Israelis and Jews.

This is a symptom common to the American political left. We witnessed this last year when Bryan Thompson, the CEO of the UnitedHealthcare insurance company, was assassinated by a 26-year-old “activist” who was applauded and treated as a hero by many on the left. Such reactions were not limited to left-wing social media but were echoed by the “yes, but” comments from politicians like Sen.

Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (N.Y.), when they condemned the murder but still rationalized the political positions that led to it.

As I noted at the time, this wasn’t the first time in American history that policy debates morphed into political violence. Anarchist bombings and assassinations of public figures, such as President William McKinley in 1901, were seen by some as a legitimate response to the excesses of capitalism during the “Gilded Age.” In the 1960s, an element of the movement protesting American involvement in the Vietnam War similarly became violent as the Weather Underground engaged in a campaign of domestic terrorism that involved larceny and murder, as well as bombings of sites like the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

Those episodes, as well as the murder of Thompson, provided an ominous precedent for the latest iteration of left-wing activism that focuses its hate against Jews and Israel, rather than business leaders and their political allies.

That’s why no one should be surprised about what happened in our nation’s capital. Israelis and Jews have been under siege since Oct. 7, both in the United States and elsewhere around the world, as sympathy for Hamas and belief in the illegitimacy of the sole Jewish state on the planet has spread.

It’s not good enough for those who oppose insurance companies or Israel to say that nothing justifies violence while also supporting the agendas of those who have already crossed the line from advocacy to murder. A desire to seek scapegoats or to apply toxic Marxist ideology to political disputes often leads to the same dismal conclusion. That is why decent people should disavow such causes rather than treating instances of violence as something that should impel us to do the bidding of those who claim to be “pro-Palestinian.”

It has long been apparent that in the current atmosphere that “pro-Palestinian” has become indistinguishable from antisemitism. Regardless of the mental state of the D.C. shooter or the denials of responsibility of anti-Israel groups, violence against Israelis and Jews was always the inevitable next step. Those who chant for Jewish genocide cannot disavow their role in legitimizing violence against Jews. The response from the U.S. government and decent people everywhere should be to isolate this movement and to take whatever measures are needed to ensure that such assassinations, coupled with the targeting of Jewish students on college campuses, come to an end. (JNS May 22)

Jerusalem Day and the Lie of ‘East Jerusalem’

By Moshe Phillips

Yom Yerushalayim, or Jerusalem Day, is observed this year from Sunday evening, May 25, through Monday night, May 26. It celebrates the 58th anniversary of the reunification of Judaism’s holiest city.

Today, Israel’s control of the parts of Jerusalem that the Israeli Defense Forces liberated in 1967 is consistently and vehemently contested by Arabs, who claim those areas rightfully belong to them. This claim is a cornerstone of the daily anti-Israel propaganda disseminated by Mahmoud Abbas and his Palestinian Authority associates.

Here’s the thing, though: the area Abbas refers to isn’t “East Jerusalem” at all. It’s just Jerusalem. What’s more, there is no political entity known as “East Jerusalem”—not now and not at any point in history.

The latest of these claims came on May 17 in Baghdad, where Abbas addressed fellow strongmen and despots at their 34th Arab Summit.

Abbas said: “We highly commend the role of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, which chairs the Arab-Islamic Committee. We thank all its members for their efforts in garnering international support for the realization of an independent Palestinian state with its capital in East Jerusalem and for securing global recognition of this state.”

Immediately after the Old City was liberated, Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook (1891–1982), son of Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook (1865–1935), the first Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi, told news reporters:

“We announce to all of Israel, and to all of the world, that by Divine command, we have returned to our home, to our holy city. From this day forth, we shall never budge from here! We have come home!”

What was Rabbi Kook referring to, if not what is now labeled

“East Jerusalem”?

“East Jerusalem” is simply Jerusalem. Every biblical mention of a specific location in Jerusalem refers to an area that Abbas wants Israel to surrender. The term does not appear in the Torah because it is a modern political invention. When Israel’s enemies created this false name for Jerusalem’s Old City and surrounding neighborhood, including the Western Wall, it was meant to sever the connection between Israel and Judaism’s holiest sites.

The truth is that Yom Yerushalayim celebrates the end of the Arab world’s first successful attempt to separate Jerusalem from the Jewish people.

Immediately after Israel declared its independence, the Arab Legion from what is now Jordan attacked Jerusalem. After intense fighting and a brutal siege, the Jewish Quarter of the Old City was lost to the Arab Legion on May 27, 1948. The surviving Jewish residents sought refuge in Jerusalem’s New City. When the IDF liberated the Old City in June 1967, it found 34 of its 35 synagogues either completely or partially destroyed. So, too, were the yeshivahs. Hundreds of Torah scrolls and thousands of Jewish religious books had been desecrated and burned.

In another blatant violation of international law, the Jordanians forbade Jews from visiting the Old City during the years they illegally occupied Jerusalem. Numerous requests were made. Historical records show that in 1954, Gen. Vagn Bennike, then the chief of staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), relayed to the Jordanians a request by a small number of Jews “to cross into the Old City to offer prayers at the Western Wall.”

Similar appeals were made to U.S. government officials. In response to one such petition, Assistant Secretary of State Henry Byroade responded that because of “unfortunate tension” between the Jordanians and the Israelis, a “practical arrangement cannot be worked out.”

That Jews were not just able to visit the Western Wall but live again in the Old City is what is being celebrated on Yom Yerushalayim.

Tragically, there are elements within the American Jewish community who would have U.S. Jews believe that what they call “East Jerusalem” should not be part of Israel.

In a March 30, 2022, article on its website, J Street declared: “East Jerusalem” has been under Israeli control since 1967, and was annexed in 1980, which was internationally condemned as an illegal occupation. Ever since then, the right-wing settlement movement, which seeks a ‘unified Israeli capital,’ has been pushing to move Palestinians out of East Jerusalem and Israelis in.”

How can any American Jewish organization that advocates for parts of Jerusalem to be Judenrein be welcomed in our synagogues?

J Street is not alone in its repeated use of the term “East Jerusalem,” even though no such place exists. Rep. Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.) used it in a May 14 press release promoting her nakba anti-Israel legislation.

Hopefully, one day soon, the dangerous fiction of “East Jerusalem” will be a term uttered only by non-Jewish extremists. (JNS May 20)

The Mideast has Changed. The Fighting isn’t Over Yet, but Israel has Already Won By Dan Shueftan

In the regional arena, Israel has already won the war that started on October 7, 2023. While the fighting is not over yet, a confrontation with Iran is potentially dangerous and there is no sustainable “solution” available in Gaza, the balance of power in the Middle East shifted dramatically in favour of the Jewish state and its de-facto Arab allies.

The radicals have never been more humiliated, isolated, vulnerable and intimidated and the moderate, stability-seeking Arab regimes have only rarely felt more self-assured and surreptitiously grateful for the Israeli resolve in fighting their common enemies.

For decades, from the mid-1950s to the 1970s, the radicals used to dominate the “Arab World”. Gamal Abd-al Nasser created a messianic movement, encompassing politically aware Arab elites and “masses”, stretching “from the (Atlantic) Ocean to the (Persian) Gulf”, enthusiastically backing the aggressive anti-American and anti-Israel policies of Egypt’s charismatic president.

Following three major confrontations with Israel – in 1967, 1969/1970 and 1973 – President Anwar Sadat realised that Egypt could no longer sustain perpetual war. In 1979, Sadat signed a separate

peace treaty with Israel, practically abandoning all the Arab radicals who were committed to the “liberation of Palestine” from the Jews. In the absence of Egyptian leadership and the failure of the Assad dynasty in Syria and Iraq’s Saddam Hussein to replace it, all-Arab “liberation” wars essentially ended half a century ago. The 1994 Jordanian-Israeli peace treaty and the 2020 Abraham Accords consolidated this strategic reality.

The emergence of the Iranian threat following the 1979 Islamic Revolution provided the radicals with an alternative regional power leadership for the struggle against Israel, but the strategic environment was fundamentally different from that of the 20th century. The Arab component of this radical camp included only one significant state – Syria – and even that was torn apart by a savage civil war. The rest were mere remnants of the once-mighty Arab coalition, militarily potent and dangerous, but politically and nationally marginal: Hamas in Gaza, Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Houthis in Yemen and Shiite militias in Iraq and Syria.

Much more important than their marginality, these dedicated foes of Israel – Iran and its proxies, the Muslim Brotherhood and the Houthis – are also the most dangerous enemies, regionally and domestically, of most Arab states and their regimes.

Since October 7, Israel has devastated in Gaza the only Arab state-like entity controlled by the Muslim Brotherhood. The IDF also reduced Hezbollah from an intimidating strategic threat, practically in control of Lebanon, to a major nuisance, fighting a rearguard battle for its position in Beirut and in the South. And Israel’s Air Force exposed the supreme vulnerability of Iran’s most-defended sites. Israel’s unique missile-defence system, assisted by the American Central Command, in coordination with Arab Gulf States and Jordan, demonstrated the structural limitations of Iran’s only strategic response to Israeli deep-penetration raids. All this directly led to the collapse of Assad’s regime in Damascus, immediately followed by the utter destruction of its military hardware.

In Cairo, Amman, Riyadh, Abu Dhabi, and Rabat, Arab leaders could not afford to infuriate their populaces by openly celebrating the dramatic weakening of their regional deadly enemies and giving Israel the well-deserved credit for inflicting the required blows. However, they know that sustainable Israeli resilience, strategic power, determination and tenacity in the struggle against common radical enemies are indispensable for their own regional welfare, sometimes even their existence. Whereas America is immeasurably more powerful, Israel, in their experience, is an infinitely more trustworthy and dependable partner in this ongoing struggle. Israel is unlikely to engage in appeasement of the mullahs in Tehran, as President Barack Obama did, or try to save the savage Houthi rebels in Yemen from the Saudis and the Emiratis, hoping to pacify them with humanitarian aid, as President Joe Biden did.

Arab leaders, particularly in the Gulf, were deeply impressed by Israel’s demonstrated ability to do what they themselves craved: to consistently deepen and widen its alliance with the United States, even during unfriendly administrations, while, at the same time ignoring and even openly rejecting ill-advised directives from Washington on critical issues of national security.

Capitulating only to Biden’s obsession of delivering humongous “humanitarian” aid to Hamas in all the wrong times and locations, Israel consistently rejected his pressure of prematurely stopping the war in early 2024. Yielding to these demands would have turned the war against the regional radicals into a defeat for Israel and most Arab states. It would have restored Hamas in Gaza, prevented Hezbollah’s defeat in Lebanon and precluded the exposure of Iran’s strategic vulnerability.

The war is not over. The crucial question of Iran’s nuclear quest and hegemonial ambitions is still to be determined. The objective of consolidating an American-led regional structure incorporating Israel, Saudi Arabia and other Arab states is somewhat more difficult in the immediate future, even when it is far more desirable and possible in the mid and long range. In Gaza, there can be no constructive alternative to Hamas and protracted clashes are inevitable. In Lebanon, Hezbollah will at least partially recuperate. In Syria, a prominent and hostile Turkish position could present Israel with a serious threat.

The Middle East as a whole, however, has taken a major turn in the last year and a half – a turn for the better, for a change. The radicals are much weaker. Consequently, the mainstream stability-seeking Arab states are more confident. Israel is exhausted, but much safer, and even the Americans are somewhat more realistic. The

region is still volatile and a lot depends on containing Iran, but the chances to avoid a catastrophe are better than they have been in a long time and everybody recognises Israel's indispensable contribution. (Jewish Journal May 15)

Like Two Peas in a Pod By Eric Levine

Despite being one of the worst foreign-policy decisions in the history of the United States, the "wisdom" of the 2015 nuclear deal is embraced as an article of faith by Democrats. Some see the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), as genius simply because it was President Barack Obama's idea. Others support it because they missed the day in school when their history teacher taught how the policy of appeasement led to the ravages of World War II. A third group, radical progressives, support it because they are inherently antisemitic, and they know the Iran nuclear deal undermines Israel's security. They fundamentally believe that what's bad for Israel is good for the world.

Once a fringe group within the Democratic Party, far-left progressives like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) are now not just the ascendant wing of the party but dominate it along with the like-minded Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.). That's because morally bankrupt leaders like Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) deluded themselves into believing that they could control the upstarts by appeasing them. The progressives now have the old guard on the run.

Republicans potentially face a similar situation. Once viewed as a fringe element within Republican ranks, the far-right isolationist wing is beginning to gain traction. Party leadership has it within its power to keep the upstart isolationist fringe on the outside looking in, but it requires a conscious effort and political courage to do so.

An overwhelming majority of Republicans oppose Obama's abomination of an agreement. They understand that Iran is an implacable enemy of Western civilization that must be dealt with forcefully. Even so, the far-right isolationist wing in the GOP and the radical left of the Democratic Party see the "wisdom" of the Iran nuclear deal and advocate for an American retreat from the Middle East.

Both oppose attacking Iran. Neither seems to care if Iran obtains a nuclear weapon. Most critically, both are obsessed with the notion that America's approach to Iran, which they see as unnecessarily wrongheaded and confrontational, is driven by the Jews.

Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene (R-Ga.) is a perfect example of a far-right isolationist Republican. When recently asked her views about an American-led military strike on Iran, she posted on X, "I represent the base, and when I'm frustrated and upset over the direction of things, you better be clear, the base is not happy. I campaigned for no more wars. And now we are supposedly on the verge of going to war against Iran. I don't think we should be bombing foreign countries on behalf of other foreign countries, especially when they have their own nuclear weapons and massive military strength."

Of course, any U.S. military strike against Iran would not be on behalf of Israel but because Washington felt it necessary to do so. Like her radical progressive kindred spirits, Greene must have missed the day in school when they taught about the post-war, American-led world order. She also must not have read the papers or watched the news, as Iran:

- Stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran on Nov. 4, 1979, and took 60 American hostages for 444 days;
- Murdered 241 U.S. service members (220 Marines, 18 U.S. Navy sailors, and 3 U.S. Army soldiers) by bombing the Marine barracks in Beirut on Oct. 23, 1983;
- Blew up the Khobar Tower housing complex in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, on June 25, 1996, killing 19 U.S. airmen and injuring more than 400 U.S. and international military members and civilians;
- Was responsible for one-third of the American dead and wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan;
- Tried to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States in Washington, D.C., on Oct. 11, 2011;
- Tried to destabilize and overthrow the Saudi royal family;
- Directly participated in more than 100 terrorist attacks against American service members (one of whom was my son) in Syria, as they defended our homeland fighting ISIS;
- Remains the leading state sponsor of global terrorism and is responsible for terror attacks around the globe;
- Funded, armed and directed the Houthis as they attacked American merchant shipping in the Red Sea;

- Joined the new axis of evil with China, Russia and North Korea, which is dedicated to upending the American-led world order; and
- Attempted to assassinate President Donald Trump.

Exactly on whose behalf would we be attacking Iran? Where precisely do Israel and the Jews fit into these acts of war against the United States and the international community? A nuclear Iran is a threat to the entire world. For Greene, though, it is the Jews, and the Jews alone, who will lead us into disaster.

What further puts the lie to Greene's ravings, however, is that, unlike Europe, Vietnam, Korea and other countries around the world, Israel fights its own wars. Israel has never asked for American boots on the ground in any of its wars. This includes the current war against Hamas, in which Israel is fighting for its very existence.

If anything, Israel is currently fighting our war. Its battles against Iran and its proxies—Hamas, Hezbollah and the Houthis—are those on behalf of Western civilization. We are morally obligated to help Israel in every way possible.

On the other hand, what should we expect from Greene (who said that Jews shot lasers from the sky to start forest fires in California), would not support the Antisemitism Awareness Act because she believes that the Jews killed Christ? She who addressed a white supremacist Nazi rally in October 2017 with well-known fascist Nick Fuentes, at which she praised Russian President Vladimir Putin and Adolf Hitler?

This is where far-right isolationist "intellectuals" like former Fox News show host Tucker Carlson come in. Well-spoken, well-educated and well-connected, Carlson attempts to give the extreme isolationist right the ideological legitimacy it requires to be taken seriously as a political movement. Unfortunately for him, his discourse is no less detached from reality and no less antisemitic than Greene's. Look no further than his position on an American military attack against Iran.

"Whatever you think of tariffs, it's clear that now is the worst possible time for the United States to participate in a military strike on Iran," Carlson said. "We can't afford it. Thousands of Americans would die. We'd lose the war that follows. Nothing would be more destructive to our country. And yet we're closer than ever, thanks to unrelenting pressure from neocons. This is suicidal. Anyone advocating for conflict with Iran is not an ally of the United States, but an enemy."

The term "neocons" is code for "Jews" and Israel's supporters. Don't take my word for it. Just ask Carlson's fellow ideological and political traveler, convicted felon Roger Stone. When asked about Carlson's statement, Stone answered: "I could not agree more. We cannot be suckered into a war with Iran by the Israelis."

It should come as no surprise that Carlson would peddle in some of the most rank antisemitism. This is a man who hosts Holocaust deniers on his show, heaps praise on war criminals like Putin and regularly talks of his version of revisionist history. Putting aside the age-old trope of accusing Jews of dual loyalty, his political analysis of what would happen should America attack Iran is farcical and belied by history.

The ultimate fallacy of Carlson's argument is that an attack on Iran will start a war. Iran has been at war with the United States since 1979. The real question is: When will we fight back?

To his credit, Trump took the initial steps against Iran in his first term. This same argument of imminent armageddon was the same nonsense given to the president during his first term to try and persuade him not to eliminate Iran's leading terrorist, Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force Gen. Qassem Soleimani, and not to institute his policy of "maximum pressure" on the regime. Rather than mount a full-scale war with America, Tehran cowered before the United States. There was no meaningful response. Trump successfully reconstituted American deterrence and made the world a safer place.

There may well be good-faith arguments as to why the United States should not attack Iran. However, "don't give in to the Jews" is not one of them. That is true whether the argument is made by the radical progressive left of the Democratic Party or the far-right isolationists of the Republican Party.

The major difference is that the Democratic Party has abandoned Israel, while the overwhelming majority of the Republican Party stands with the Jewish state. As Schumer has demonstrated, however, Israel's GOP supporters should not take that for granted. We must remain vigilant. (JNS May 20)
