

עש"ק פרשת שלח (קרה בא"י)
27 Sivan 5786
June 12, 2026
Issue number 1620



Jerusalem 7:05
Toronto 8:42

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*

Lebanon Finally Says it Out Loud: It does not Belong to Iran

By Khaled Abu Toameh

For years, many Lebanese politicians avoided publicly confronting the obvious truth: Iran, through its proxy

Hezbollah, has hijacked Lebanon's sovereignty, transformed the country into a battlefield, and dragged its people into repeated wars with Israel.

Now, perhaps for the first time in such direct and uncompromising language, Lebanon's President Joseph Aoun and Prime Minister Nawaf Salam are openly acknowledging what many Lebanese have known for decades.

Their statements are significant because they expose the central role played by the Iranian regime and Hezbollah in destroying what was once one of the most prosperous and stable countries in the Middle East.

Aoun accused Iran of using Lebanon as a "bargaining chip" in its conflict with the United States and demanded that Tehran stop interfering in Lebanese affairs. Addressing the Iranian regime directly, Aoun declared: "You are not trying to help us; the people of Lebanon are paying the price for your own interests. ... Our interests do not align with yours. ... This is not your country, it is our country."

Aoun also rejected Hezbollah's claim to speak on behalf of Lebanon and said that Hezbollah Secretary-General Naim Qassem "does not represent the Lebanese people."

The Lebanese president emphasized that his people are exhausted by the endless conflict initiated by Hezbollah: "The Lebanese are fed up with the war between Israel and Hezbollah."

He revealed that Lebanese from various religious communities, including Shi'ites, had told him they were tired of Hezbollah's wars.

Aoun's remarks amount to a public admission that Hezbollah has effectively created a state within a state, one that decides when Lebanon goes to war and when it agrees to a ceasefire, regardless of the wishes of the elected government of the Lebanese people.

Salam was equally blunt. Speaking at the launch of a U.N. humanitarian appeal, he called on Iran to stop exploiting Lebanon for its own regional ambitions: "Spare our south, and cease treating it and its people as mere bargaining chips to improve your negotiation terms. We are a nation that refuses to become a mailbox for others' messages or an open arena for their wars. Lebanon is no one's pawn on a table, and the south is no one's reserve front."

Perhaps most remarkably, Salam openly acknowledged that Iran's rejection of a ceasefire agreement exposed the true nature of the conflict: "[T]he Lebanese were stunned yesterday to find the Iranian Revolutionary Guard as the first to reject it, before any other party. This is yet another confirmation that this war is not ours, that it is not fought for us, but on our soil and at the expense of our people."

Those words represent a devastating indictment of Hezbollah and its Iranian sponsors.

For years, Hezbollah has justified its military activities by claiming to "defend Lebanon." Yet Lebanon's own prime minister is now effectively saying publicly that Hezbollah's war serves foreign interests, not Lebanese ones.

The Lebanese leaders are finally saying publicly what many observers have argued for years: Hezbollah is not defending Lebanon. It is defending Iran's regional interests.

All terrorist roads lead first to Tehran.

The consequences have been catastrophic. Once known as the "Switzerland of the Middle East," Lebanon has become a failed state plagued by economic collapse, political paralysis, corruption and recurring warfare.

Hundreds of thousands of Lebanese civilians have paid a heavy price for Hezbollah's decisions. Entire communities have been displaced. Homes have been destroyed. Businesses have collapsed.

Commentary...

A Difference of Perception about the Northern Front

By Amit Segal

On the streets of Israel, it's easy to spot the sourness and bitterness regarding events on the northern front—from children running to bomb shelters to the devastating drone attacks. The difficult conversation between U.S. President Donald Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu didn't help the mood.

These feelings do not reach the upper levels of the Israel Defense Forces, which speak of an achievement unseen in years, and of an opportunity for peace and quiet for a long time to come. Reconciling these two pictures isn't possible, but describing them is.

The IDF's top brass is convinced that Hezbollah is a semi-dismantled organization that has absorbed the hardest blow in its history. It had 30,000 operatives on Oct. 6, 2023; since then, 8,000 have been killed and about the same number wounded. "Even a jihadist enemy is dying for a ceasefire."

The chief of staff, for instance, said in closed discussions that he is in favor of an agreement, under the following conditions: One, Hezbollah's withdrawal beyond the Litani River. Two, the destruction of all its infrastructure, this time not by the impotent Lebanese Army, but by an Israeli-American mechanism. Three, an IDF presence in Southern Lebanon, which includes, for example, the Beaufort Castle.

In retrospect, the IDF dislikes the phrase "Hezbollah fell into a strategic ambush," which a senior military official used on the day the organization came to Iran's aid at the start of "Roaring Lion" and opened fire.

"Even before the war, we saw that the organization was increasingly struggling to absorb the Israeli blows; they were on the verge of responding even without Khamenei's assassination," he said.

The army was furious with reserve generals who went on television panels to criticize what they saw as an overly harsh Israeli response to a symbolic barrage in memory of the supreme leader.

"They probably don't understand what we saw in the first week of March," they say. "Hundreds of Radwan terrorists crossing the Litani. Why did they come? If there had been even one raid on a single community, we all would have had to pack our bags and resign. What were we supposed to do if not meet them on their own turf and kill them?"

Since then, Hezbollah has focused on its only success: drones. The defense establishment suggests managing the expectations of the public, since there will not be a single comprehensive solution for drones, such as the Iron Dome format. There will be many solutions that together will create a partial response.

"No weapon introduced to the battlefield has ever disappeared, it only evolved. Tanks are here to stay, anti-tank missiles likewise, planes and now drones," they note.

However, they emphasize that the agreement could be here within days to weeks. If they could, they would urge the residents of Kiryat Shmona and Nahariya to suffer for a few more weeks and receive an agreement that will bring peace for many years to come.

It's been a long time since I've seen such a gap between harsh public sentiment and sweeping optimism at the top. How long? Twenty years minus two months, at the end of the Second Lebanon War. Back then, the public was right that the war was a dismal failure and Hezbollah had grown stronger; hopefully, this time the decision-makers are right. (Israel Hayom Jun 9)

Families have lost loved ones.

“The Lebanese people,” Aoun noted, “have placed on me the task of ending the war, and they do not deserve to see their homes destroyed every five or 10 years.”

The tragedy of Lebanon closely resembles the tragedy of the Gaza Strip.

Just as Hezbollah serves as Iran’s proxy in Lebanon, Hamas serves as Iran’s proxy among the Palestinians. Like Hezbollah, Hamas receives funding, weapons, training and political backing from Tehran. Like Hezbollah in Lebanon, Hamas launched a war that brought devastation upon its own people.

After the Hamas-led massacre in southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023, Gaza suffered unimaginable destruction and humanitarian hardship. The Palestinians in the coastal enclave are paying the price for decisions made by Hamas, another Islamist terrorist organization acting in accordance with Iran’s broader regional agenda.

All terrorist roads lead first to Tehran.

Without Iran’s interference in Lebanese and Palestinian affairs, both peoples would likely be focused on building their economies, strengthening their institutions and improving the lives of their citizens, instead of enduring endless cycles of war and destruction.

The Iranian regime has consistently used its proxies to spread instability throughout the Middle East: Hezbollah in Lebanon; Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad in the Gaza Strip; the Houthis in Yemen; and Shi’ite militias in Iraq and Syria.

The goal is always the same: Expand Iranian influence while keeping the region in a permanent state of confrontation.

The statements of Aoun and Salam, however, raise a serious question. If Lebanon’s leaders recognize that Iran and Hezbollah are responsible for much of their country’s suffering, then why have they not acted decisively against Hezbollah?

U.N. Security Council resolutions have long called for the disarmament of all militias in Lebanon.

The ceasefire agreements brokered by the Trump administration were also supposed to strengthen Lebanese sovereignty and curb Hezbollah’s military power.

Why, then, is Hezbollah still armed? Why does it continue to decide matters of war and peace? Why is the Lebanese government still unable or unwilling to assert full authority over its territory?

The same questions apply to Hamas. Why is Hamas still in control of large parts of the Gaza Strip? Why is the Trump administration’s “Board of Peace” still talking about the disarmament of Hamas instead of insisting upon it? Why do mediators continue to negotiate with terrorist organizations that openly reject disarmament?

Lebanon is no one’s pawn on a table, and the south is no one’s reserve front.

Complaining about Iranian interference alone will not restore Lebanon’s sovereignty or bring stability to the Gaza Strip.

The Trump administration would do itself a great service if it could recognize that the source of much of the region’s instability remains the Iranian regime and its proxies. Washington needs to demand the immediate and unconditional disarmament of Hezbollah and Hamas—terrorist organizations that seek Israel’s destruction.

The administration would greatly help its agenda if it insisted that the Lebanese government alone exercise control over decisions of war and peace. It would help to stress that no sovereign state can tolerate an armed militia operating outside government authority.

Aoun is right when he says that Lebanon does not belong to Iran. The challenge now is to translate these words into action.

As long as Hezbollah and Hamas remain armed and in power, and the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps remains ruling Iran, there will be no lasting peace or stability in the Middle East. All three remain deeply committed to their jihad (“holy war”) against Israel and are prepared to pursue it indefinitely.

Lebanon’s leaders have identified the problem. The question is whether they have the courage and the whole-hearted, committed support of the United States to back it up. (Gatestone Jun 8)

Turning Self-Defence into a War Crime -- Again

By Melanie Phillips

Even by the standards of the BBC’s venomous bias against Israel, today’s exchange between BBC Radio Today programme anchor Anna Foster and Israeli spokesman Alex Gandler was jaw-dropping.

Gandler tried to present an accurate timeline and context to show that Israel had attacked both Lebanon and Iran in response to their attacks on Israel. He didn’t get very far. Constantly interrupting him, with a voice made tremulous with indignation at Israel’s apparent perfidy, Foster insisted that the Lebanon ceasefire wasn’t really a ceasefire at all because Israel had continued to attack Hezbollah. Indeed, she charged, in attacking Beirut “it looks like Israel doesn’t want a ceasefire”. To Foster, it seems, demonic Israel just wants to kill people for its own opaque but nefarious purposes.

She ignored the fact that Hezbollah had broken that ceasefire with a volley of missiles into Israel just three hours after it was agreed; that it has been killing IDF soldiers in Lebanon almost every day since then; and that Israel’s strike on the Hezbollah stronghold in the Dahiyeh district of Beirut was in response to another volley of missiles at two towns in northern Israel.

Spluttering over Gandler’s attempt to explain that the Lebanese government had shown itself systemically incapable of reining Hezbollah in, and brushing aside his statement that Hezbollah is the biggest non-state actor in the Middle East using civilians as cover, Foster insisted that “Israel has occupied a huge swathe of south of Lebanon. How can that be described as proportionate?” The majority of Lebanese including women and children, she expostulated, were being killed by Israeli forces.

Ah yes, there we had it once again: the wickedly obtuse refusal by the BBC to acknowledge the difference between intentionally targeting civilians — a war crime — and civilians unintentionally killed in a just war of defence.

Hezbollah and Tehran have been targeting Israeli civilians in their missile attacks: a war crime. Israel by contrast targeted Hezbollah’s main command centre in Beirut and strategic military installations such as anti-aircraft defence batteries, Tehran’s main airport, and a drone factory: justified and proportionate self-defence. But to Foster, Israel is apparently the war criminal.

Not content with all that, she then accused Israel of cutting essential aid to Gaza, including food, by closing the crossings. Hang on — wasn’t this a discussion about the war in Lebanon and Iran? Don’t be silly — for the BBC there’s only one issue, the evil of Israel; and so why not throw in its alleged war crimes in Gaza for good measure as a job lot of libels? It’s surprising Foster didn’t take the opportunity also to throw in genocide, murdering Palestinian children to bake them into matzo crackers, and using satanic Jewish power to control America.

In vain did Gandler protest that, because of the missile attacks by Iran, everything in Israel had been cancelled today. And anyway, there was no absence of food in Gaza. “Really?” said Foster in contemptuous disbelief.

But yes, really. The charge that Israel has been starving the Gazans during the war was another libel. As the Israeli humanitarian agency COGAT later stated, operating the crossings under fire puts lives at risk, both on the Israeli side and on the Gazan side. The crossings therefore couldn’t be operated safely under such conditions and would be reopened gradually when it was safe to do so. To accuse Israel of malevolently halting food supplies in such circumstances was hard to credit.

After this travesty of a professional journalistic interview, on came the BBC’s international editor Jeremy Bowen — the quintessence of the BBC’s institutional anti-Israelism — to state blandly and without elaboration, “Much what he [Gandler] said is not borne out by the facts”.

This was the same Bowen who, in October 2023 a few hours after the first reports of an explosion at Gaza’s al Ahli hospital that

Hamas blamed on Israel, reported: “The missile hit the hospital not long after dark. ... The explosion destroyed al Ahli hospital. ... The building was flattened”.

Even after it was established that a Palestinian Islamic Jihad rocket had fallen short and merely hit the hospital’s car park, killing a far smaller number of people, Bowen airily dismissed his falsehoods, saying, “I don’t regret one thing in my reporting because I think I was measured throughout. I didn’t race to judgment.”

A couple of hours earlier on this morning’s Today programme, a Beirut-based reporter was asked: “What caused Israel to attack Iran?” His answer was all about Netanyahu’s politicking over the Iran deal and pressure from the Israeli public, with only a passing and vague reference to Hezbollah’s continued attacks on Israel. No mention of the nearly daily killing of IDF soldiers in Lebanon, nor the missile attack on Israel’s north which breached Trump’s ceasefire terms and precipitated Israel’s attack on Beirut.

Other media have also been presenting Israel falsely as the aggressor rather than defending itself against Iran which has been using Hezbollah to attack Israel. It’s business as usual — the truly wicked media distortions which present Israel falsely as evil rather than the target of real, unadulterated evil, and which have done so much to fuel murderous hatred against Israel and the Jewish people. (Substack Jun 8)

The War on Campus Jewry has Nothing to do with Gaza

By Shabbos Kestenbaum

The Trump administration sued the University of California last week, accusing UCLA of “deliberate indifferen[ce]” while Jewish students were blocked from buildings, pepper-sprayed and beaten during campus protests. UCLA is just one example of how Jewish students are being harassed, excluded and systematically separated from their own institutions.

The ceasefire in Gaza has been in effect since the fall of 2025. But if you believed, as university administrators long insisted, that campus antisemitism was a reaction to events in the Middle East, then the last academic year should have buried that theory for good.

The war in Gaza is no longer the excuse because it was never the cause.

I am a proud American and Orthodox Jew. I sued Harvard University for its failure to protect Jewish students, wrote to its antisemitism task force more than 40 times without receiving a single reply, testified before Congress and spoke at the Republican National Convention. I have paid a real price for saying publicly what I know to be true. It is a pattern that has been building since Oct. 7, 2023, and it has not stopped, and it has continued because it was never actually about Gaza.

Consider what happened this year at the University of Maryland, home to the country’s fourth-largest Jewish student body. The anti-Israel JusticeUMD party chose the night of Yom Kippur 2025 to pass a BDS resolution calling for economic warfare against Israel. Jewish students, fasting and in synagogue, could not be present to speak against it.

That is not democracy. It is a deliberate ambush, timed to silence the community that has the most at stake. When the spring 2026 elections came, a Jewish candidate was targeted on YikYak with a swastika replacing the letter “O” in his ticket name and a caption calling him “Chief Hitlerite.” The elections commission responded not by punishing the antisemitic attack, but by disqualifying the Jewish candidate’s entire ticket.

On May 1, the student senate at The New School voted to, purportedly, strip funding from its Hillel chapter, branding the organization complicit in “violations of international law.” It was the first time a student government in America moved to sever ties with the primary institution of Jewish communal life on a college campus.

This is not an isolated flare-up. It is a chapter in a documented

national campaign, Drop Hillel, with the explicit goal of removing Hillel from campuses because of its Zionist affiliations. The Anti-Defamation League has recorded more than 100 incidents targeting Hillel in the 10 months following Oct. 7 alone.

These are not outliers. At Yale, visibly Jewish students were harassed while walking back from Shabbat dinner. At the University of South Florida, Jewish students were denied entry to a public campus event while non-Jewish students walked in. A Hillel survey found 83% of Jewish college students have experienced or witnessed antisemitism firsthand since Oct. 7.

The ceasefire did not stop this. The hostage deal did not stop this. This was never contingent on Israel’s war against Hamas.

University administrators already have the tools they need: codes of conduct, anti-discrimination policies, rules for recognized student organizations and election oversight procedures. What they lack is the will to use them.

I have testified before Congress. I sued the richest university in the world. I know what institutional cowardice looks like up close. I also know what accountability looks like because I forced it. Harvard settled, and a federal judge allowed that case to proceed after rejecting the university’s motion to dismiss. These things happen when people stop accepting excuses and start demanding enforcement.

Student governments were built to represent all students, not to be captured by factions that plan to exclude Jews from democratic participation. Universities were built to be institutions of learning, not battlegrounds where Jewish students must hide their identity to earn social acceptance.

The answer to every pressure to surrender our institutions and redefine our identity on other people’s terms has always been the same: a deeper commitment to our communities, to one another and to our unassailable right to define for ourselves what Jewish life means. (JNS Jun 8)

Israel has No Choice but to Risk Open Conflict with Trump

By Michael B. Oren

In my media interviews, I am often asked: “Has Israel become the 51st state of the US?” With half a smile, I answer: “If only. American states have far more freedom and room to maneuver than Israel does.”

This situation is hardly new. Ever since U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower demanded that Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion halt the Israel Defense Forces’ campaign against Egypt in Sinai in 1956, and later withdraw from Gaza, the United States has consistently forced Israel to stop fighting and agree to a ceasefire.

That was true in the 1967 Six-Day War, which Israel wanted to continue for an eighth day; in the 1973 Yom Kippur War; in both Lebanon wars; and in all our operations in Gaza. Even pro-Israel presidents such as Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon and George W. Bush threatened severe consequences if Israel ignored their demands to cease fire.

In May 2021, on the eighth day of “Operation Guardian of the Walls” against Hamas, I received a phone call from a senior adviser to U.S. President Joe Biden, who asked me to convey an urgent message to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu: “Israel must end the operation tonight, or risk losing American support.” Netanyahu was furious. He wanted to keep fighting for at least three more days. But he immediately complied. The operation ended that evening.

The only difference between U.S. President Donald Trump and previous presidents is his tendency to treat us publicly as vassals who must obey his every order. This is humiliating and demoralizing for Israel and, unfortunately, it strengthens our enemies. But that raises the question: Must Israel obey the White House’s demands under all circumstances and at any price?

Historically, the answer has been “no.” U.S. presidents not only

ordered Israel to stop fighting; they also opposed its decision to go to war in the first place. That was the case in every war from the establishment of the state until “Operation Rising Lion” last year. Yet Israel’s leaders, despite the risk of a rift with Washington, determined that our basic security was at stake and decided to act.

Ironically, every time Israel defied the White House and went to war—in 1948, for example, in 1967 and in the 1981 strike on Iraq’s nuclear reactor—we earned America’s respect. Every time we surrendered to pressure and showed restraint—in 1973 and in the 1991 Gulf War—we earned America’s contempt.

This record is especially relevant today, when Hezbollah will undoubtedly violate any ceasefire and continue attacking us. Israel needs to defend and save the north, but in doing so, it risks not only war with Iran but also an open confrontation with President Trump. As in the past, Israel will have no choice but to act.

With its eyes wide open to the potential cost, Israel must show that it is neither a U.S. vassal nor its 51st state, but a sovereign country with an unshakable duty to defend its territory and its citizens. In the end, if history is our guide, Trump will respect us for it. (Israel Hayom Jun 10)

The Temple Mount ‘Status Quo’ in 2026: What’s Next?

By Harry H. Moskoff

The term “status quo” as it relates to the Temple Mount is officially obsolete. The facts on the ground are evolving so rapidly that the phrase no longer really applies.

When I last penned an opinion piece on this volatile topic a decade ago, the dynamics of the site were entirely different. For years, any shift on the mount favored only the Arab community, dictated by the heavy-handed oversight of the Jordanian Waqf. Visiting Jews and Christians were subjected to routine intimidation, harassment and immediate removal by authorities for the “crime” of whispering a prayer.

While the Israeli Antiquities Authority strictly enforced its laws against uncovering biblical archaeology there, the waqf was quietly permitted to use heavy machinery to bulldoze through the holy site, a concession made by past Israeli leadership and the Obama administration to placate threats of violence. This resulted in the unilateral construction of three unauthorized mosques, including the massive underground El-Marwani Mosque.

Now, however, a paradigm shift in another direction has been underway, and it’s nothing short of miraculous. Indeed, a new era of religious liberty was to follow.

The turning point began building in 2015, when a Jerusalem court upheld the fundamental right to Jewish prayer on the Temple Mount, setting off a chain reaction that has slowly dismantled restrictions for religious Jews and Christian tourists alike. What started as a trickle has become a roaring wave of religious tolerance and prayer.

In 2018, Jewish worshippers were finally authorized to pray in designated areas, thereby affirming a new, more inclusive approach. Since then there has been a progressively rising trend, and the results are staggering: Last year alone, more than 68,000 Jews ascended the mount to worship—a 22% explosion over the previous year, spanning a massive cross-section of Israeli society.

Today, daily prayer quorums (minyans or minyanim in Hebrew) meet openly during morning and afternoon hours on the eastern perimeter behind the Dome of the Rock, complete with authorized prayer sheets and prostration—Jewish rituals not witnessed on the Temple Mount for centuries. If this trend continues, the area could one day represent the future of religious toleration in Israel, and perhaps be a beacon for that eventuality throughout the entire world.

The profound impact of this shift was brought home to me recently in Jerusalem’s Old City during a conversation with an Arab tour guide. He noted that the mount has become significantly quieter and less attended from the Arab side, and proceeded to offer me an astonishing

explanation: “Ever since they started seeing Jews bowing all the way to the ground, they realized that the Jews actually respect the site and are genuinely praying without political incentive. Seeing the ‘real Jews,’ i.e., the ultra-Orthodox in black hats, and not just the ‘settlers in sandals,’ bowing to God changed their perspective.”

But don’t be fooled. This is not a modern anomaly; it is the fulfillment of a long-standing Jewish dream and a miraculous return to a historical reality that is anchored in powerful religious and historical precedent.

Following the 1967 Six-Day War, Chief Rabbi Shlomo Goren envisioned a dedicated Jewish prayer space on the Temple Mount. Decades later, the late Sephardic Chief Rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu submitted official blueprints to the Knesset for a Jewish house of prayer in the open northeastern sector, declaring that the Children of Israel could finally enter the permitted areas in holiness and purity according to Jewish law.

Today, that dream has been revived. An amuta (nonprofit organization) has officially resubmitted revamped architectural drawings and halachic rulings to the Knesset for a small synagogue, designed to be accessed discreetly from outside the Eastern Wall—adjacent to the Golden Gate and nowhere near the Muslim shrines.

Skeptics continue to ask me, though: Is there a precedent for a synagogue existing alongside Muslim structures on the mount? History answers with a resounding yes:

- The Persian Era (613 C.E.): Following the ousting of the Byzantines, a Jewish house of worship, including an altar, was immediately re-established by the new governor, King Khosru II, as documented by the renowned Jewish poet Rabbi Elazar Kalir.
- Early Muslim Rule (638 C.E.): Caliph Umar permitted Jews to pray on the mount without interference, half a century before the Dome of the Rock was built. Even the gradual metamorphosis of the Temple Mount into Islam’s third holiest site didn’t result in a total exclusion of Jews from the location (see Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphate*).
- The Golden Age of Coexistence: For centuries under Fatimid rule in the early Muslim period, a wooden synagogue operated actively on the sacred compound. Pilgrims left Hebrew inscriptions on the internal walls of the Golden Gate (still visible today). This fact was also substantiated by a Karaite sectarian by the name of Solomon ben Jeroham, who lived in Jerusalem between 940 and 960, affirming that “the courtyards of the Temple were turned over to them and they [the Jews] prayed there for many years.”
- Mamluk and Ottoman Periods: Renowned medieval Jewish authorities like the Radbaz (1479–1573) documented that Jerusalem’s Jews regularly ascended the Mount to pray with absolutely zero objections from local Muslim clerics (*Responsa of the Radbaz*, vol. 2, 691).

History, therefore, proves that a shared space for prayer on the mount is not a pipe dream. It is a proven, historical formula for stability.

For the Israelis, the true wonder of the Temple Mount lies not just in what was built on the surface, but in what is poised to be revealed below. With more than 50 known underground tunnels waiting to be safely explored, the site is a treasure trove where biblical archaeology is actively coming to life.

Indeed, if the current momentum is any indication, the next decade will not necessarily bring more conflict, but a glorious redefinition of the true status quo, a return to a holy house of prayer to be a permanent symbol of peace for all peoples. By replacing political agendas of forced exclusion with strength, mutual respect and genuine religious liberty, the Temple Mount is positioned to become the ultimate global beacon of faith.

It will ultimately stand as a place where Jews, Muslims, Christians and all well-meaning people can worship God Almighty in unprecedented peace.

May it be realized in our days. (JNS Jun 11)