



Jerusalem 7:06
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*

Commentary...

The Lion Roars By Joseph Puder

Israel is a strong country because its home front endures impossible travails.

Imagine going through years of running to public shelters, safe rooms, or, when caught in a car during an Iranian, Houthis, Hamas or Hezbollah rocket, missile or drone attack, getting out and lying flat on the ground, hands protecting head.

Israel's triumph last year over the vaunted Hezbollah—the most lethal weapon in the arsenal of the Islamic Republic of Iran—and its campaign against Iran dubbed "Operation Rising Lion," will be remembered for generations as a biblical-like victory.

Israel must win its wars because defeat means doom for the Jewish people, not only in Israel but in the Diaspora as well.

In its 1948 War of Independence, Israel stood against well-armed Arab states and murderous militias. The war was right after the Holocaust, and despite tremendous odds, Israel's small population repelled its enemies using improvised arms and desperate determination. The Jews vanquished the Arab armies, and the country's narrow and vulnerable borders were expanded. Despite the tremendous casualties suffered by the yishuv, the Jewish community in British Mandatory Palestine, some 1% of its total population, the home front stood firm, knowing that there was nowhere to escape. It was victory or death.

On the eve of the Six-Day War in 1967, the entire nation mobilized. High school students even dug graves in anticipation of high casualty rates. Every family in Israel had a relative or a close friend mobilized in the service of the nation. The triumph against Egypt, Syria and Jordan, aided by contingents from Iraq, Algeria, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and Sudan, was spectacular. Jewish pride swelled throughout the Diaspora. Gentiles were surprised by Jewish Israeli bravery and spirit. As one woman remarked at the time, "I didn't know that Jews knew how to fight." As an independent people, Jews proved that once free in their homeland, they prepared and trained themselves to defend and, when necessary, to fight like ferocious lions.

More than 2,000 years of antisemitism, persecution, the Holocaust and homelessness, a new breed had been created, native Israelis or sabras, named after a thorny but sweet cactus bush.

Steeped in biblical stories and dwelling in the land of the Bible, they rose to be Gideons, Samsons and Davids: thoughtful, resourceful and strong. They became hardworking farmers, ranchers, business owners and computer scientists, alongside combat soldiers, pilots and naval commandos. Most of all, their accumulated intelligence as a people helped to develop a most fearsome intelligence system.

Overconfidence and a degree of arrogance among the military brass resulted in early tragedies during the Yom Kippur War in 1973. Once again, Israeli resilience coupled with the country's credo of *ayn breira*, "there is no choice," turned the initial debacle into a stunning victory, with the Israel Defense Forces reaching the gates of Cairo and Damascus.

Exactly 50 years later, the "conception" of the military brass proved erroneous, once again, by believing that the terrorist organization Hamas was contained. This gave Israel the "Black Shabbat" of Oct. 7, 2023, the deadliest day for Jews since the Holocaust. In the aftermath, it was ordinary Israelis on the home front who exhibited the spirit of the nation. People volunteered to help neighbors, especially the families of the bereaved. This connection was something that, just days earlier, would have been unthinkable as

the Nation of Israel was on the verge of a civil war after endless antigovernment demonstrations and some pilots even refusing to return to duty as reservists.

Israel's enemies had sensed that the Jewish state was

crumbling, and Iran orchestrated its proxies' multifront attacks. The will to live turned Israelis into lions. The Gaza Strip was mostly flattened, and Israeli ingenuity produced the beeper campaign that eliminated Hezbollah's top command. The group's extensive missile arsenal, which once threatened Israel, was also largely destroyed.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, described as the "head of the octopus," is Israel's ultimate target because it serves as an existential threat to the Jewish state. Almost like a repeat of the miraculous Six-Day War, in four days, the mighty Iranian threat has nearly evaporated, as Israeli jets control the skies over Tehran. Media in Arab Gulf states described Iran as nothing but a "spider web" following Israel's brilliant operation that exposed the nation of about 90 million people as weak and vulnerable. Desperate to prove that they are still relevant and "strong," the ayatollah regime unleashed barrage after barrage of lethal ballistic missiles and drones on Israel's civilian population.

Israel's aerial-defense system intercepted most of the missiles and drones. Unfortunately, the defense system that includes the Iron Dome, David's Sling and the Arrow system is not a solid, hermetic defensive guarantee. Several direct hits caused death and destruction. Still, the nation of lions urged the government and the IDF to continue the job of dismantling the Iranian nuclear threat. The 10 million Israelis running into shelters and safe rooms have endured, as they have for years.

Significantly, no nation, including the United States, was willing to take on the Islamic Republic of Iran despite its provocations and attempted assassinations in Europe and an attempt on the life of then-presidential candidate Donald Trump. Israel alone has done what the rest of the civilized world was reluctant to do by taking on the head of the octopus. Israel deserves credit for saving the world from a nuclear-armed fanatical regime whose messianic beliefs call for an Armageddon that, according to its fanatics, would end with the appearance of the vanished 12th Shi'ite imam.

A nuclear Iran portends a nuclear Holocaust for Israel and the West. Israel displayed the courage and determination to actualize the promise of "Never Again." (JNS Jun 19)

The Time for Definitive Choices by Trump

By Fiamma Nirenstein

As Israeli forces rack up decisive victories in their war against Iran, a new conversation is quietly unfolding in Washington—and United States President Donald Trump is at the center of it.

Trump began taking decisive steps last Friday, as news emerged that Israel's operations in its war against Iran were shaping up to be a stunning success against what many view as the world's most abominable regime. It was in this moment that Trump—beyond his longstanding sympathy for Israel—started aligning his vision of a new world order.

According to sources close to the president, June 13, 2025, marked a significant shift. News out of Israel—precision strikes deep in Iranian territory, the degradation of Tehran's missile systems, the collapse of key Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (ICRC) command structures—signaled not just a tactical win, but the beginning of something larger: the unraveling of the most dangerous regime on earth.

And Trump is paying close attention.

It was never just about his well-documented affinity for Israel. Now, as Iran teeters, Trump appears to be aligning Israel's war effort with his own broader vision: the re-establishment of a Pax Americana—a global reset that can roll back the threats of nuclear

blackmail and jihadist tyranny for good.

In comments on Social Truth in which he said the U.S. is not assassinating Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei "for now," he invoked a phrase not heard in decades: "Unconditional surrender." It was the standard once applied to Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. And now, in Trump's view, it should apply to Khamenei's Iran: no enrichment, no hegemony, no threats against Israel, no stranglehold on the Iranian people.

Behind the scenes, the options are being weighed. American bunker-busting bombs could soon be in play to target Fordow, Iran's most fortified nuclear facility. Some Israeli analysts believe Jerusalem might act alone—through an operation so daring it would enter the annals of history alongside Entebbe and Osirak.

But more realistically, the regime is bleeding out. Khamenei's inner circle is fractured. His ballistic missile infrastructure lies in ruins. Ninety percent of the missiles launched by Iran have been destroyed by Israeli airstrikes or intercepted en route. ICRC has been decimated. What was once the sharp edge of radical Islam is now a cornered beast.

For Trump, this is more than a regional skirmish. This is about energy security. It's about the Strait of Hormuz, Bandar Abbas and Tehran's partnerships with Russia, China and even North Korea—which now threatens to intervene. It's about stopping the metastasis of tyranny.

Since late 2024, Trump had hoped for a diplomatic off-ramp. He dispatched adviser Steve Witkoff to explore a potential deal. He even sent a letter to Khamenei expressing a desire for peace. But the Iranian Supreme Leader refused to halt uranium enrichment. Even this week, he issued fresh threats—against Netanyahu and Trump himself.

That may have been a mistake.

The tide began to turn long before this week. In December, Israel finalized its operational plans. In February, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu brought Washington new intelligence: Iran's nuclear program had passed the point of no return. The window to act was rapidly closing.

Trump never slammed the door on diplomacy, but he made peace with the possibility that no agreement was possible. On June 8 at Camp David—briefed by the CIA on Israel's pending operation—he left the door open for support. Following a long call with Netanyahu, Trump confided to allies: "Maybe I'll have to help him."

What's happening now is not just military. It's moral. It's about a nation—Israel—choosing to live. From the pager-triggered strike of September 17 to the elimination of Hezbollah chief Hassan Nasrallah on September 27, Israel has done what no one expected. It held the Syrian border. It took on the Houthis. It plunged into the heart of the storm while the world hesitated.

Trump sees it. And so does his base. His ambassador to Israel and friend, Mike Huckabee, tweeted a letter he had sent to the president, which read: "No President in my lifetime has been in a position like yours. Not since Truman in 1945. I don't reach out to persuade you. Only to encourage you. I believe you will hear from heaven and that voice is far more important than mine or ANYONE else's."

Romantic? Perhaps. But not wrong.

What Israel is doing is historic. It's not just self-defense—it's reshaping the regional order. Trump, for all his unpredictability, understands what opportunity looks like. And this may be his moment to seize it.

As one Israeli official recently put it: "The foundation of Israel won't be complete until the threat of annihilation is no longer part of daily life."

That vision is now within reach. (JNS Jun 19)

Israel Won't Fall for the Illusion of Stability By Garry Kasparov

Pour one out for Ben Rhodes. In some ways, The World as It Is is a perfect title for the longtime Obama foreign policy adviser's memoir, because the illusion of the status quo is all that Rhodes and his fellow travelers could ever stomach in geopolitics. But it was always just that: an illusion. Rhodes never really looked at the world as it is; he simply

imagined a facade of post-Cold War stability. The historic Israeli military campaign against Iran that began last week represents another crack in that facade, joining the October 7, 2023, attack on Israel, Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea, and the Arab Spring.

Washington War Games: How the U.S. Prepared for an Iran Strike

After spending the past year and a half knocking out one Iranian proxy after another, Israel has dealt the Islamic Republic a heavy blow in recent days. Not just militarily, but politically too. Israeli forces killed a number of senior officials in Tehran, including the chief of staff of the military, the head of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, the commander of the IRGC's Aerospace Force, and a senior adviser to Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei. And that was just in the first few hours. I suspect that the occupational hazards associated with employment in the Iranian government will continue to grow with each passing day.

Now that the Islamic Republic is severely weakened, the alarmist foreign policy commentariat is apprising us of the unacceptable risks, raising their well-worn red flags. (Or should I say white flags?) "Escalation!" "Global war!" And the ultimate enemy of the status quo: "regime change!" In the shadow of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, I don't doubt that Rhodes and some like him had good intentions, but we all know what the road to hell is paved with.

Under President Obama, American officials frequently stared down the nastiest offenders in the international rogues' gallery and insisted that there was "no military solution." "No military solution" might sound nice to enlightened ears. Unfortunately, it's a meaningless slogan. Tellingly, Russian officials repeat it all the time too. The Russian ambassador to the UN used that Ben Rhodes-esque turn of phrase at the Security Council, declaring that "no military solution can be legitimate or viable" in Iran. But Russia does believe there are military solutions to its problems—ask any Ukrainian, Syrian, or Georgian. Yet too many in Washington remain determined to fight armed marauders with flowery words.

The initial takeaway from Rhodes on the well-earned battering that the Iranian regime has received was that "this war will above all harm innocent people for no good reason."

In the shadow of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, I don't doubt that Rhodes and some like him had good intentions, but we all know what the road to hell is paved with.

Notice the reliance on the future tense. Status-quo huggers hide behind fear of what might happen instead of confronting the brutal truth of what's actually happened or is happening. Call it a preference for deadly reality over frightening uncertainty.

If you are worried about innocent people being killed, as Rhodes claims to be, spare a thought for the millions of Iranians who face imprisonment, torture, or death if they dare deviate from the strict precepts of the Islamic Revolution. Or the hundreds of thousands of Syrians whose murder Iran was an accomplice to. Or the Ukrainian civilians who have found themselves on the receiving end of over 8,000 Iranian-made suicide drones over the past three years. Or the scores of Argentine Jews blown up in a Buenos Aires Jewish community center in 1994 without even the thinnest of martial pretexts.

Rhodes still has his students in Washington. Democratic Connecticut senator Chris Murphy was quick and confident in his pronouncement that Israel's operation in Iran "risks a regional war that will likely be catastrophic for America." Maybe. But a regional war was already underway before Israel struck last week. Iran was already supporting the Houthis in Yemen, Hamas in Gaza, Hezbollah in Lebanon, and Russia in Ukraine. Israel is simply moving things toward a more decisive conclusion. What does Murphy suppose should be done about what's already taking place? Put a Band-Aid on it and wait for the next war?

Republicans are not immune from this malaise, though the root cause differs. Secretary of State Marco Rubio's immediate reaction to the Israeli strikes in Iran was to say "wasn't us!"—and then to plead with Tehran not to attack U.S. personnel and assets in the Middle

East. Murphy is acting out of ideological blindness. Rubio, like nearly all of his Republican colleagues, is wanting for a spine. Whatever the reason, people like Murphy and Rubio lack vision and will end up getting left behind by events.

I am not going to pretend that what comes next for Iranians will be easy. Anyone who suggests that 46 years of theocratic dictatorship will be replaced by Swedish social democracy overnight is not being honest with you.

Throughout my decades of pro-democracy activism in Russia, I have faced the same dilemma. Generations raised under Soviet communism and a quarter century of a KGB mafia state have not exactly made the Russian Federation fertile ground for freedom. Whenever I call for the end of Vladimir Putin's regime, someone inevitably asks: What if the next guy is worse?

What if? There is no way of knowing for sure. Today, we Russians can tell you with our five senses and the names of friends who have been beaten, jailed, or assassinated that the current guy is that bad, and that he is worse than he was the year before. We have to face the real dangers of letting a murderous crime boss remain at large rather than agonize over the theoretical risk that a more ruthless capo replaces him. It's our responsibility to meet the enormous challenges of the world as it is so that we don't wait forever to realize the world as it ought to be. (The Free Press Jun 17)

On a Tugboat into the Firing Line: Why Israelis are Trying to 'Escape' from Holiday Beaches Back to a War Zone

By Yaakov Katz

About an hour into the journey, the sky in front of us suddenly lit up. First came a flash - then a streak of fire, followed by an explosion. One. Then another. And another.

We all knew what we were witnessing. Our group - nine Israelis on a tugboat that had just left the port of Limassol in Cyprus - was sailing directly into a country at war. Ballistic missiles had been launched by Iran, and they were raining down on our homeland, our destination.

No one spoke of turning back. If anything, the explosions hardened our resolve. We were going home.

My journey had started days earlier, on Thursday night, when I boarded an El Al flight from London to Tel Aviv. The flight was scheduled to land at 3:30 am just as the Iranian attacks began. We were minutes from touchdown when the plane suddenly banked and turned. Twenty minutes later, we were on the ground in Paphos, Cyprus.

The mood on the plane was tense, even chaotic. Israel had struck Iran, and now Iran was striking back. With little information and rising fear, panic spread among some passengers. A few suffered panic attacks, and thanks to a couple of doctors onboard they received the help they needed.

For nearly two days, I was stuck in Cyprus. But wherever I went - on the streets, at the hotel, or at the Chabad House that opened its doors within hours - I encountered something deeply moving. Israelis, dozens of them, men and women, young and old were all singularly focused on one goal: getting back to Israel.

There were options, but few were good. Flying to Jordan or Egypt and then crossing by land into Israel was technically possible, but both countries had been placed under a Level 4 travel warning - the highest - by Israel's National Security Council. I spoke with some government officials and they strongly urged against doing it. Nevertheless, I booked a ticket for Monday night, saying to myself that if nothing else worked out by then I would try the Amman option.

Then there was another possibility, one that at first felt more rumour than reality: a boat to Israel. No official channels, no formal instructions. Just WhatsApp messages and Facebook groups.

Then, on Sunday evening, a fellow Israeli stranded in Cyprus called me. "There's a boat leaving Limassol in an hour," he said. "There are two available spots and if you want them, they are yours."

I said yes. I spoke to another friend who I had met and offered him to join. He was in and we headed to Limassol. We didn't know what

kind of vessel we were boarding just that it was heading home.

Turns out it was a tugboat. Literally. The kind used to haul other ships. It belonged to an Israeli company that had moved some of its equipment out of Haifa for safekeeping during the war. Now, it was returning to Israel and one of the passengers had convinced the owner to take people along.

There were nine of us on board, all squeezed into the tight quarters of the boat. The captain, Eli, was a veteran Israeli sailor who didn't say much. He simply took the wheel and set course.

Among the passengers: a brother and sister who grow flowers in the Arava and had been in Holland on a sales trip. The brother insisted on coming back to report for IDF reserves. A CEO from Karmiel whose company employs 100 people and now struggles to fulfill international orders under fire. A woman who works in energy and left the Ivory Coast to come back to her kids. A high-tech investor returning to his children and grandchildren who had moved into his home's safe room. Two young men, fresh out of the army, who had cut short their post-service backpacking trip after facing antisemitic attacks in Greece for speaking Hebrew. And the man who had pulled the whole thing together - a former Israeli Navy officer now working in maritime safety tech.

None of us asked if it was safe. Not because we were reckless, but because we were Israeli. That's not how we think. This instinct to return - especially in times of danger - is etched into our national DNA. It's who we are.

We saw this after the Hamas invasion on October 7, when thousands of Israelis dropped everything and made their way home. From New York, Berlin, Bangkok, Sydney, they came to don their uniforms, to reunite with their units, to defend their country. Even civilians found ways to contribute, flying to Israel to volunteer, bring supplies, or just to stand in solidarity.

It's what ties us to one another, to our land, and to our shared fate. When the sirens wail and the skies explode, Israelis don't run away. They run literally into the fire.

In moments like these, you understand what truly defines a nation. It's not just the borders on a map or the policies debated in the Knesset. It's the people who, when everything is on fire, still choose to come home.

Even by tugboat. (Jewish Chronicle Jun 17)

The writer is a former editor-in-chief of The Jerusalem Post.

The Anti-Israel, Pro-Iran Faction on the Right Lost Trump

By Jonathan S. Tobin.

Who is losing the most in the successful strikes on Iran by the Israeli Defense Forces? At the top of the list is, obviously, the Islamist regime itself. It has had its terrorist infrastructure in the form of the leadership of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, as well as what is left of its military, decapitated. And, of course, it has suffered significant damage to its nuclear facilities, in addition to its oil and gas industry, which is the foundation of the despotic government's already-shaky economy.

We don't know yet what this will mean for the future of the theocratic regime that has maintained power since it took over the country in 1979. And it's still far from clear whether the credibility lost by the way that the Israeli Air Force has been able to operate with impunity, destroying the government's assets and leaders, will be enough to shake off their tyrannical grip on a nation that desperately needs to replace them.

The other big loser in this struggle is a "woke right" faction of the conservative movement in the United States that opposes Israel and has been fervently opposed to any action to stop Iran from gaining nuclear weapons. More to the point, this rag-tag group of talk-show hosts, right-wing influencers and social-media gurus who can't seem to mention Israel without betraying their antisemitic tendencies has lost President Donald Trump.

Or to be more precise, they never really had him.

The most prominent of these voices on the right is former Fox News host Tucker Carlson, whose shows and posts on the X platform

reach many millions of people. As I've noted previously, Carlson is adamant about his distaste for Israel and his willingness to shill for the Iranian regime as well as its ally Qatar.

But he's just the most well-known and loudest of a group of people who have utilized the Internet to create the impression that Trump's voters share their views about foreign policy—most specifically, when it comes to Israel and Iran. What they have failed to understand is that their soft spot for Tehran—a government that has never wavered from its belief that America was the “Great Satan” with whom they were locked in perpetual conflict—had nothing to do with what Trump has dubbed his “America First” foreign policy.

As polls have consistently shown, Republicans and conservatives overwhelmingly support Israel, even as Democrats and the political left have abandoned it. Yet Carlson and his woke right acolytes, imitators and supporters are certain that Trump will lose his MAGA supporters if he continues to support Israel and doesn't pursue a policy of appeasing Iran. However, as Trump said in an interview in *The Atlantic*, he's the one who decides how to define “America First,” not Carlson and the trolls he platforms or plays to via the Internet.

Their confusion stems from their conviction that Trump's determination not to commit America to more failed wars like those in Iraq and Afghanistan meant that he had no interest in supporting Israel's defense or was willing to let a nation like Iran acquire the ability to intimidate or destroy the Jewish state, as well as Arab allies like Saudi Arabia.

It's true that Trump chose not to join Israel's effort to decapitate the Iranian regime and its nuclear facilities. And his futile negotiations with the rogue regime to get it to give up its nuclear ambitions, led by his clueless Middle East envoy Steve Witkoff, may have given both Tehran and some on the American far right the impression that in his second term, Trump would be channeling the foreign policy of former president Barack Obama.

Even if those negotiations weren't part of some elaborate feint to lull the Iranians into a sense of complacency about their security and the strength of their diplomatic position, as the Hudson Institute's Michael Doran thinks is possible, Trump's position on Israel's Iran offensive is a grave disappointment to woke right pundits and posters.

Future historians will have to unravel the minute-by-minute process by which Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu informed Trump of the Jewish state's intentions to attack Iran. We know that the president was publicly saying that he wanted negotiations, which had already reached an impasse, to continue, and that he didn't want the Israelis to strike. Yet the Israelis went ahead with it anyway.

Some critics of Trump and Israel, on both the left and the right, are claiming that this illustrated the administration's weakness as well as demonstrated that their conspiratorial fantasies about the Jews running American foreign policy were true.

Yet had he wanted to, Trump could have stopped the Israelis or at least distanced the United States from the war in a tangible manner that would have severely impacted Jerusalem's decision-making process.

That is, after all, exactly what previous presidents, including Obama and Joe Biden, had done when they repeatedly forbade the Israelis from striking Iran. He could have, as Biden or whoever was actually running foreign policy from 2021 to 2025 did, threatened to stop the resupply of arms and ammunitions needed to fight Hamas in Gaza since the start of the war, the Palestinians and their Iranian backers began with the Hamas atrocities in Israel on Oct. 7, 2023. Trump could have threatened not to help defend Israel from Iranian missile attacks. And he could have publicly disavowed the Israeli offensive by condemning it. Yet although that's what Carlson wanted, the president did none of that.

Instead, he subsequently pronounced the Israeli attacks as “excellent,” telling the world that he had known “everything” about them in advance and warned of “more to come” if the Iranians did not come to heel.

U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio and others in the administration made it clear that Washington was not participating in

the fighting. But the continued American involvement in Israel's defense against Iran's indiscriminate firing of missiles and drones aimed at civilians in Tel Aviv, Haifa and Jerusalem—Jews, Arabs, Christians and others—shows that the two allies are still closely cooperating in this struggle against a common foe.

The point is that Trump meant what he said about not wanting to mire the United States in more “forever” wars based on the dubious prospects of “nation-building” aimed at transforming Islamic countries into Western-style democracies. He also meant what he said about never allowing Iran to get a nuclear weapon—something that Obama and Biden's policies, cheered on by feckless European allies and domestic leftist and far-right factions that hate Israel, would have guaranteed in the long run. Trump fancies himself a great dealmaker and peacemaker, and his success in brokering the Abraham Accords in his first term gives him reason for doing so. Still, he also doesn't want to repeat Obama and Biden's mistakes in appeasing Iran. His backing for Israel's efforts, couched though they were with calls for Iran to rejoin his nuclear talks, was the opposite of the anti-Israel crowd's definition of “America First.”

Supporters and foes of Israel are expending enormous energy trying to interpret his every statement about the current war, in which at one moment, he cheers on the Israelis, and then expresses his desire for the war to end and for Jerusalem and Tehran to make a deal.

More consistency in his communications would be preferable. But that isn't how Trump operates. As with most such efforts to monitor his daily flow of statements and social-media postings on a host of issues, this is a fool's errand. Trump's stand on the war against Iran is not a matter of interpretation. Had he been determined to stop it, he could have done so or imposed penalties on Israel in such a way as to make its continuation difficult, if not impossible.

Unlike the liberal foreign-policy establishment or America's European allies, who have no appetite for confronting the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism that believes itself engaged in an Islamic “forever war” to destroy the West, Trump understands that such threats cannot be appeased. It's true that he'd prefer that Middle East policy be a function of trade deals rather than security crises. Yet he neither shares the Obama vision of a rapprochement with Iran in which it would replace Israel and Saudi Arabia as the lynchpin of American ties to the region nor believes in the fairy tale about the mullahs wanting to “get right with the world,” as the 44th president did.

If he wants improved relations with Iran, it is now apparent that it will only be on his terms, which would involve nuclear concessions that Tehran won't concede without compromising the regime's basic purpose of a never-ending war on the West and Israel.

Those expecting Trump to force Israel to “restrain” itself and end the war prematurely are likely to be as disappointed as those, like Carlson, who want Washington to end the alliance with Jerusalem. Like most Americans, Trump wants a non-nuclear Iran and admires the ingenuity, brilliance and daring of the IDF's operations, while believing that this is a job that the Israelis ought to do themselves, albeit with U.S. assistance.

Restraint in resisting Iran and an unwillingness to understand the threat to the West posed by a terrorist regime is what brought the world to this point. The effort to prevent Israel from achieving its goal of doing irreparable damage to the Iranian nuclear and ballistic-missile programs is the true threat to peace at the moment. The accusation that Israel “started” this conflict is a lie since Iran has been engaged in fomenting a seven-front war against the Jewish state via its terrorist proxies long before the events of Oct. 7.

Whatever the ultimate outcome of this campaign turns out to be, the notion that Trump was an isolationist who would betray Israel—as those on the left and the woke right want the United States to do—has proved to be an antisemitic pipe dream. Tucker Carlson and his crowd had no influence on the first Trump administration's historic pro-Israel policies. And, much to their consternation, they are having just as little impact on those of his second. (JNS Jun 16)