



Commentary...

Do an End-Run Around Yisrael Beytenu By Edith Druyan-Ohayon

The current season of the political thriller "Battles on the Right" will reach an end at the beginning of August, when the final party lists for the September election are submitted. But there is only one way to ensure a happy ending in the season finale – by at least four right-wing parties running on a joint list.

Some people are opting to stay in the corner into which they've backed themselves, and some are choosing to be responsible adults. Last week, immediately following the mutual and completely unnecessary mudslinging between former Education Minister Naftali Bennett and MK Moti Yogeve, head of the National Union party Bezalel Smotrich started trying to coax the leaders of the other right-wing parties out of the trenches they had dug and lay the groundwork for a joint right-wing list. Everyone has demands and everyone has their own understandable reasoning. But today, everyone must be willing to demonstrate pragmatism and a willingness to compromise.

The parties to the Right of the Likud need to secure at least 12 seats in the 2019 do-over election. That can only happen if they run together. Less ego; more responsibility to the public. The only way to thwart Yisrael Beytenu leader Avigdor Lieberman's intention to force a unity government that will weaken the national camp – and possibly recommend a left-wing candidate for prime minister – is to do an end-run around Yisrael Beytenu, by several seats. That is the goal.

There is a place on the Right and certainly among the religious-Zionist camp for debates but there's no point in holding them right now because the Right is starting off the new election campaign from a clearly disadvantageous position. Not necessarily an ideological disadvantage, but one of morale. In the last episode, the Right won the election but lost the battle to assemble a government. Right-wing voters expected, justifiably, four strong years in power, but received only billions of shekels down the drain. The far-right split, and those behind the split lost. Now that they are being presented with a chance to fix it, they are busy fighting over who will be No. 1 on the list. In a proper scenario, at least four parties – the New Right, Habayit Hayehudi, National Union, and Otzma Yehudit – would agree to run as a joint right-wing list, even if it is only a technical bloc for the sake of the election.

We must ensure a strong Right in the upcoming election, one that comprises the Likud and a single strong party to the Right of the Likud with which the latter can form a coalition committed to the values of the national camp. The choice will be between policy based on applying Israeli sovereignty and promoting Israel as a Jewish, democratic nation or a left-wing state that will concede territory and demonstrate ineffectuality against the Palestinians; between a strong coalition that will pass nationalist laws of strategic value, or a weak one.

MK Smotrich did well to bring the pragmatic discourse a step in the direction of the right-wing unity we long for. Now leader of Habayit Hayehudi Rafi Peretz needs to shush the wheeler-dealers in his party, approve the deal with Tkuma and Otzma Yehudit as soon as possible, and then sit down and discuss details with former ministers Bennett and Ayelet Shaked until the joint list we all hope for is secured. (Israel Hayom Jun 19)

The One Thing Missing from Trump's Middle East Peace Plan

By David Grantham

Said legendary English novelist Samuel Butler, "Life is the art of drawing sufficient conclusions from insufficient premises."

Piecing together what little information the Trump administration has released on its first-ever Middle East peace proposal shows it is focused more on economic incentives than physical borders. Despite insufficient information about the plan, however, many have already predicted the deal's failure.

Perhaps few can envision this plan succeeding because the administration has remained silent on how they will overcome the central

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*

cause of collapse for every past peace deal—Palestinian unwillingness to accept Israel's right to exist.

What has been said about the deal is worth noting.

Senior adviser to U.S. President Donald Trump Jared Kushner has publicly and repeatedly brushed off

the "two state" approach as "old traditional talking points." The administration reportedly aims to distance itself from failed ideas of statehood—a major shift in policy.

Drafters of the agreement have also made known that economic incentives await agreeable Palestinians, and that the deal's so-called "bottom up" approach to peace through improved infrastructure, government reform and human investment will leverage private-public cooperation.

Kushner has made clear that cross-sector partnership will be at the center of the plan, and it's good to see free-market participation breaking governments' stranglehold over economic reform. Bureaucratic monopolies have cost billions, with little change in Palestinian circumstances to show for it.

Lastly, the actions of drafters have made clear that the United States wants definite pledges of investment or pledges of non-interference from the Arab World. The administration rightly predicts that success will come only when there is Arab commitment to and a financial stake in a permanent solution.

The most telling part of all, however, is what's not said.

Outside of comments made by U.S. Middle East envoy Jason Greenblatt that "core political issues [still] have to be resolved," the administration has kept quiet about how it will persuade Palestinians to accept Israel's right to exist. It is hard to believe the ideas revealed so far can overcome the very issue that has undermined past peace plans.

Of course, we can expect that the plan will likely benefit Israel based on the administration's past behavior. Though pulling funding from UNRWA, moving the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem and recognizing the Golan Heights as Israeli territory were not unconventional ideas. They were long-sought policies that took incredible political stamina to achieve. Willpower is not the same as ingenuity.

That leaves us with a serious gap. We simply do not know how this peace plan will change the minds of those unwilling to accept Israel's right to exist.

Kushner has already hedged his bets, saying "good money" is on the proposal failing. The Trump administration's post-solution strategy should then be to solidify its pro-Israel stance. The U.S. government must make every effort to persuade Palestinians that the war is over. That they lost. The Jewish state will endure regardless of their war of attrition—a war that has only served to erode their own lives.

As the old adage goes, bitterness is drinking poison and hoping the other person dies. Palestinians continue to drink the poison supplied by radical leadership and manipulative Arab governments. We have sufficient information to conclude that peace will endure when Palestinians are persuaded to stop drinking the poison. (JNS Jun 20)

The writer, a senior fellow at the Center for a Secure Free Society, is a U.S. veteran, having served in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Appalling Political Exploitation of a 7-Year-Old's Rape

By Ruthie Blum

Given the nationwide response to the brutal rape of a 7-year-old Israeli girl by the Palestinian janitor at her elementary school—while two other accomplices egged him on—it's no wonder that her parents waited weeks before complaining to authorities. Indeed, since the story was reported on Monday, it has become the subject of a political debate.

As painful as this must be for the child's traumatized family, it is not surprising. With three months to go before the "do-over" Knesset elections, no issue is off-limits in the fray. And this one involves several elements to argue over simultaneously.

The story, as revealed so far, is that the victim was groomed by her attacker, Mahmoud Katasa, 46, over a period of time at the school in a haredi city in the Binyamin region. Katasa, a resident of the Palestinian Authority-controlled town of Deir Qaddis, befriended the child and gave her candy, according to the indictment for rape, aggravated assault and kidnapping.

On the day of the incident, Katusa allegedly grabbed the little girl after school and dragged her to a nearby home he was employed to renovate. There, two other Palestinian men—who likely also worked at the school—were present, holding the child down and telling her, “You deserve it.” These men have yet to be apprehended.

The case is being treated with such gravity that in an usual move, the head of the Israel Police investigations department, Gadi Siso, has decided to take it upon himself.

Likening his client’s indictment to the infamous Dreyfus Affair, Katusa’s lawyer called into question the victim’s accusation. An Orthodox Jew for whom the suspect worked in the past also came to his defense, saying that Katusa is a nice and reliable guy who could not have committed such a heinous act.

But the psychologists who interrogated the victim found her to be completely believable. This is probably because she gave descriptions of the assault that a young child would not have the tools to invent. Furthermore, the suspect failed a polygraph test.

Due to the many details of the case that are under a gag order, and since the investigation is ongoing, it is too early to form an opinion, other than the one that everyone shares about the evils of pedophilic rape.

This did not stop politicians and pundits across the spectrum from putting in their two cents about it, in the context of Israeli-Palestinian relations, and in that of crime and punishment. Without waiting for the facts of the case to come to light, for example, Public Security Minister Gilad Erdan said that it should be investigated as an act of terrorism. As though a Palestinian pedophile necessarily has an ulterior motive for ravaging an innocent Jewish child. Perhaps he did, but this has not been established.

Nor is it likely, since raping a 7-year-old requires a special kind of sexual deviance that nationalistic sentiment cannot induce. If it should turn out that the suspect and his vile buddies targeted the girl in question because of her being a Jewish Israeli, then terrorism, by all means, should be included in the indictment. But, again, it’s too soon to make such a snap judgement.

On the other hand, Erdan, at least, did not exploit the girl’s trauma to attack Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, as many of his political rivals did.

Take Labor Party MK Shelly Yachimovich, for instance, who declared: “The cynical, nationalistic dancing on the blood of a girl who was the victim of a shocking rape is nauseating and hair-raising, from the person who gives the middle finger to the crisis centers that treat thousands of victims. Zero empathy for the victims of all ages. Zero action [on their behalf]. This is only the second time in his political career that [Netanyahu] has bothered to address rape, and the previous time also was used for nationalistic incitement. For shame and disgust.”

Yet Netanyahu’s response to the horrors that the little girl suffered was void of all “nationalistic incitement.” In fact, it was totally proper.

“The shocking rape of a little girl shakes everyone’s heart,” he said on Monday. “I want to strengthen the family. The courts must implement the full extent of the law against everyone responsible for this terrible act.”

Meanwhile, Yisrael Beytenu leader Avigdor Lieberman—whose antics prevented Netanyahu from forming a coalition and sparked a new round of elections—released the following statement: “The case of the rape of a 7-year-old girl by a Palestinian ... is not pedophilia, but rather one of the worst forms of terrorism that I’ve heard of in recent years. ... It is exactly one of the cases about which I would not hesitate to demand of the court that it impose the death penalty on the vile terrorist. Too bad that ... Netanyahu continues to torpedo the ‘capital punishment for terrorists’ bill, despite his written and public commitment [to advance it]. Anyone merciful to the cruel ultimately is cruel to the merciful.”

It is a national disgrace that a group of adults cannot pause long enough to focus on a child whose life as she knows it has been demolished, before engaging in politics and bashing Netanyahu. (NJNS Jun 18)

Once Again, the PA Shows it doesn’t Care About Having a Viable State By Evelyn Gordon

The Palestinians’ refusal to attend a U.S.-sponsored “economic workshop” in Bahrain on June 25-26 has been widely treated as a reasonable response to the unlikelihood that U.S. President Donald Trump’s peace plan (whose economic section will be unveiled at the workshop) will satisfy their demands. But in fact, it’s merely further proof that the Palestinian leadership doesn’t actually want a state—or at least, not a viable one. Because even if Palestinian statehood isn’t imminent, economic development now would increase the viability of any future state.

This understanding is precisely what guided Israel’s leadership in both the pre-state years and the early years of statehood. The pre-state Jewish community was bitterly at odds with the ruling British over multiple violations of the promises contained in the 1917 Balfour Declaration, the 1920 San Remo Resolution and the 1922 British Mandate for Palestine. These included Britain’s serial diminishment of the territory allotted for a “Jewish national home” and its curtailment of Jewish immigration,

notoriously culminating in a total denial of entry to Jews fleeing the Nazis.

Nevertheless, the pre-state leadership still welcomed and cooperated with British efforts to develop the country, knowing that this would benefit the Jewish state once it finally arose (despite Britain’s best efforts to thwart it). And four years after Israel’s establishment, in a far more controversial decision, the government even accepted Holocaust reparations from Germany to obtain money desperately needed for the new state’s development.

The Bahrain conference requires no such morally wrenching compromise from the Palestinian Authority; its declared aim is merely to drum up investment in the Palestinian economy, primarily from Arab states and the private sector. Thus if the P.A. actually wanted to lay the groundwork for a viable state, what it ought to be doing is attending the conference and discussing these proposals. To claim that this would somehow undermine its negotiating positions is fatuous since attendance wouldn’t preclude it from rejecting any proposals that had political strings attached.

Nor is this the first time the P.A.’s behavior has proven that a functional state—as opposed to the trappings of statehood—isn’t what it wants. The most blatant example is its handling of the refugee issue.

The international community has always asserted that Palestinian statehood is necessary in part to provide a solution for Palestinian refugees. Forget for a moment that under the U.N. definition used for everyone except Palestinians, most of the nearly 5.5 million Palestinian “refugees” wouldn’t actually qualify as such. The fact remains that roughly half those 5.5 million people have lived under Palestinian rule for 25 years now. Indeed, around 40 percent of all Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip are registered as refugees.

Yet in 25 years, neither the P.A. nor Hamas (which seized control of Gaza in 2007) has moved even one of these people out of refugee camps. Nor has either Palestinian government ever accepted financial responsibility for them. In fact, one of the few things both rival governments agree on is that the international community, via donations to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), bears full responsibility for the refugees’ education, health care and welfare.

In other words, the Palestinian state-to-be, which has already been recognized as an actual state by more than two-thirds of the world, insists it has no responsibility whatsoever for a whopping 40 percent of its population. This, to put it mildly, is not how you behave if you seek to become a functioning state.

Another salient example is the ongoing crisis over taxes that Israel collects on the P.A.’s behalf and remits to it. Israel recently (and very belatedly) decided to deduct from this sum the amount of money the P.A. spends incentivizing anti-Israel terror by paying above-market salaries to jailed terrorists. In response, the P.A. has refused to accept any tax transfers at all from Israel.

Since the tax transfers fund more than half the P.A.’s budget, this decision put it on what even The New York Times admitted was “a kamikaze course.” Inter alia, the P.A. has slashed government employees’ salaries by 50 percent (an injury exacerbated by the recent news that its cabinet secretly gave its members a 67 percent raise two years ago) and stopped sending patients to Israeli hospitals for treatments unavailable in Palestinian ones.

In contrast, the Israeli deduction would at most have created only modest financial pain since it amounted to less than 5 percent of the P.A. budget. And in reality, it would have created no pain at all, since both the European Union (with some strings attached) and the Arab states (with no strings) offered to make up the shortfall. Yet the P.A. rejected both offers.

In other words, the P.A. could have received its revenues in full without even having to make any changes in its pay-for-slay program. Instead, it chose to devastate its own economy and society rather than accept any solution that didn’t require Israel to acquiesce in financial incentives for the murder of its own citizens. This, too, isn’t how you behave if you actually want to create a functioning state.

Of course, the clearest evidence of all that the Palestinian leadership doesn’t want a state is its continued rejection of every Israeli and international offer. A leadership that actually wants a state doesn’t keep rebuffing offers just because they fail to meet 100 percent of its demands. Here, too, Israel’s pre-state leadership provides an instructive contrast: Since it actually did want a state, it repeatedly said “yes” to offers far more objectionable than those the Palestinians have rejected.

The most astounding part of all this is that the rest of the world, despite insisting that it wants a “viable Palestinian state” (to quote official E.U. policy), keeps encouraging this Palestinian behavior—in this case, by openly condoning the P.A.’s refusal to go to Bahrain. Instead, the rest of the world should be telling the P.A. what Washington has: that it ought to seize any chance for economic development. Because without such development, there’s no chance of any future Palestinian state actually being viable. Instead, it would be just another failed state.

Another Anti-Israel Academic Coming to Campus Near You

By Moshe Phillips

Usually by the time we hear about an anti-Israel professor at some university, it's too late — she or he already has tenure, is chair of the department, or is so deeply entrenched in other ways that there's simply no way to prevent him or her from turning young minds against Israel for decade after decade.

But once in a while, fate hands us an alert. Take the case of Kyle Stanton of Albany, New York. He hasn't even finished his PhD yet, but he has already joined the world of academic Israel-haters. So get ready. Pretty soon he could be teaching your sons and daughters at their college.

Stanton is a PhD candidate and a teaching assistant at the State University of New York at Albany. During the past year or so, his articles have begun to appear in a variety of journals. Academic writing is among the prized stepping stones to a full-fledged university teaching position.

Stanton's first published writings reveal that he has some very strong opinions about the Arab-Israeli conflict — and a profound bias against Israel.

His first book review appeared in the pages of the journal *New Politics*. He reviewed a book called *War Against the People: Israel, the Palestinians, and Global Pacification*. From the title alone, you can guess the theme of the book. Its author is Jeff Halper, a radical-left anthropologist who has publicly compared Israel to Nazi Germany.

But Stanton thought Halper's book was just great. Most of the review consisted of quotes and paraphrases from the author, but occasionally, Stanton expressed his own views, which are quite similar to Halper's. "How is Israel able to continually occupy Palestinian territory in contravention of international law?" Stanton asks. And "The Palestinians have become human test subjects for tactics and weapons that will be used in securitizing others across the globe."

Most disturbingly, Stanton blames Israel for what he calls "the Ferguson [Missouri] Police Department's violent response to its citizens after the killing of Michael Brown." According to Stanton, the Ferguson police "became militarized and hyperaggressive" because of their joint training with the Israeli police. "The connections between Israel and American police forces should raise eyebrows," Stanton darkly warns.

One of Stanton's published articles similarly bashes Israel. The article is about American Jews and Israel, and it's co-authored with Barry Trachtenberg, a BDS advocate who teaches at Wake Forest University. Trachtenberg used to teach at the State University of New York at Albany, where Stanton is now enrolled. Perhaps that's just a coincidence.

Stanton and Trachtenberg chose to publish their article in the *Journal of Palestine Studies*, which is an anti-Israel propaganda machine disguised as a scholarly journal. Its editor is Rashid Khalidi, who for many years was a spokesman for the PLO.

The Stanton-Trachtenberg article is a rambling screed about the evil behavior of supporters of Israel. Pro-Israel forces conspire to implement a "strategy of instrumentalizing anti-Semitism as a means of countering criticism of Israel," they write. And "the tangible threats to Jewish safety that stem from white supremacists and their enablers in government are being dismissed or even excused in order to shore up Zionism and the State of Israel."

Stanton and Trachtenberg even make the ridiculous claim that the antisemitism of black militants in the 1960s was invented by the Jews. "An increasing number of Jews distanced themselves from civil rights work," they assert. "To justify their shifting stance, many Jewish leaders argued that civil rights groups were infused with anti-Semites, and they began to equate civil rights work with being anti-Semitic."

In the identification line at the end of the article, Stanton writes that he is the "author of a forthcoming article on the American Council for Judaism for *Southern Jewish History*." Actually, the article was already previously published by *Academia.edu*, so it will be interesting to see if the editors of *Southern Jewish History* are ready to become the only scholarly journal in the world that reprints previously published articles.

The article reveals much about Stanton. The American Council for Judaism was a small anti-Zionist extremist group established in 1942 — at the peak of the Holocaust — to lobby against creation of a Jewish state. Stanton turns out to be a big fan. His article is called "Blacklisting the ACJ." He depicts the Council's members as martyrs who were cruelly persecuted by pro-Zionist organizations.

Despite all of Stanton's huffing and puffing about "blacklisting," it turns out that his entire case rests on a sole decision by the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council to instruct its local chapters to refrain from contact with the American Council for Judaism. That's not "blacklisting." That's called not wanting to have anything to do with those who are actively trying to harm the Jewish people.

But get ready. This is the kind of anti-Israel drivel that you can expect your sons and daughters to be subjected to if you enroll them in the university where Kyle Stanton happens to teach. And you can bet that, thanks to his anti-Israel credentials, Stanton will land a university teaching job all too soon. (Algemeiner Jun 17)

No More the Safe Haven, No More the Promised Land

By Mordechai Kedar,

I spent five of the weeks between Passover and Shavuot of this year on a lecture tour of the US and Canada, as I do every year. The first tour took place in 2009, making this one the eleventh. Among those inviting me to speak are academic institutions, Jewish and non-Jewish public organizations, community centers and individuals. The topics of my lectures center around my research on the Middle East, including Israel, as well as Islam in its indigenous states and in those to which it has migrated.

The Jewish institutions inviting me to lecture run the gamut of North American Jewish culture: from liberal progressive, as in Reform temples, to Orthodox and even *haredi* milieus. I am invited by Jewish organizations such as IAC and asked to speak to them in Hebrew. On every tour, I meet people with diverse opinions, hear varied approaches to issues and listen to complex ideas.

In previous years, I was always asked to talk about the Middle East, the challenges facing Israel, the peace process, the "Arab Spring," Islam, ISIS and similar topics involving the region and how its problems spill over into other countries. The situation in the United States, and especially the subject of US Jewry, almost never came up in my lecture series because, in the audiences' eyes, the fact that I am an Israeli precludes my having anything to say about American Jewish affairs.

When, here and there, the topic of North American Jewry did arise, I received the incontrovertible impression that the Jews of the US and Canada feel that they live safely and securely in a Promised Land. North America was seen as such because Jews there live tranquilly in a nation devoid of anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish discrimination, where they are part of every political and social circle and thus have no cause for worry. They feel safe and secure because of the fact that the level of violence in American public space is generally low and where it is not, there is police protection for synagogues and Jewish community centers.

A Reform rabbi once made this feeling abundantly clear when he told me that "exile" is a concept, not a geographical construct. Any country in which Jews can live a secure and full life cannot be considered "exile," he said, because that word refers to a land where Jews cannot maintain their religious, cultural and physical lives in free and secure fashion. The hidden message in his words was that Israel is more of an "exile" than is America, because of the security situation prevailing in the Jewish State and the fact that Reform rabbis do not have the freedom to lead their congregations as freely as they do in the United States.

This year, however, the atmosphere greeting me during my lecture tour was entirely different. A good many Jews of all cultural types spoke clearly and openly of their fears with regard to two things: the rise in Jew-hatred and the deteriorating security situation. (I am attempting to avoid the term "anti-Semitism" because Arabs, too, are Semites). The reasons for the rise in anti-Jewish feelings are many and varied: The Christian European legacy that emigrated to the New World; Jews identified as being movers in the establishment as well as in finance, media, politics, academia, arts and film-making; Jews involved in scandals in the movie world (e.g. Harvey Weinstein) and in financial scams (Bernie Madoff); increased Islamic immigration to the US leading to political clout as seen in the election of three Muslim members of Congress for the first time in US history; identifying Jews with Israel — and more.

It is important to remember that Jews are to be found in political positions that put them in the public eye. Among the liberal Jews who surrounded President Obama were Rahm Emanuel, Dan Shapiro (then US ambassador to Israel) Jeremy Ben Ami (J Street head), Jonathan Greenblatt (currently head of the ADL) and others. Many of the Americans who opposed Obama, especially Republicans, aimed their arrows — both the airborne and more subtle ones — at those Jews. On the other hand, President Trump is surrounded by Jews as well, conservative politically and even Orthodox religiously: his daughter Ivanka, son-in-law Jared Kushner, advisor Jason Greenblatt, US ambassador to Israel David Friedman, Michael Cohen, Steve Mnuchin (Sec. of the Treasury) and others. An anti-Trump American does not care for the Jews who are closely connected to the president.

It is worthwhile mentioning that Jews held high level positions in previous Republican administrations as well: Paul Wolfowitz was Deputy Sec. of Defense under President George W. Bush, and other Jews — Douglas Feith and Richard Perle come to mind — filled key positions in the US government. Clinton, the Democrat, put Dennis Ross, Richard Holbrooke and Martin Indyk in key positions as well. The Jews have found themselves between the Republican hammer and the Democrat anvil for a long time.

Identifying Jews with big money is a widespread phenomenon in the USA, and for many reasons: Prominent investment banks — Lehman Brothers and Goldman Sachs, for example — were founded by Jews and still carry their names. During the 2008-2009 general financial crisis the two were in the epicenter of the period's economic, media and public

earthquake. Bernie Madoff, the Jewish "investor," lost the assets of thousands of American citizens.

Jews are the most prominent donors to American charitable causes, such as hospitals, universities and organizations that aid the needy. Jews donate to these causes because they feel a responsibility towards the American society which accepted and included them with unlimited affection. The donors' names are up there for all to see on plaques and above the entrances to these many institutions. The problem is that when the ordinary blue collar American who works hard to put bread on the table sees the Jewish names shining proudly on the entrances to hospitals and universities (many of which charge over \$50,000 a year in tuition fees), he associates the Jews with money and so Jewish generosity acts against the donors and the group to which they belong. Muslim Congresswoman Ilhan Omar knew what she was doing when she spoke of the connection between Jews and "Benjamins" – a term for the US \$100 bill which has Benjamin Franklin's portrait printed on it.

Currently, there are two Jewish billionaires clearly seen on the map of US politics, each providing significant financial backing to the party of his choice. One is Sheldon Adelson who supports the "Right" and the other is George Soros who supports the "Left." On opposite sides of the political map, both are the source of furious anger from those opposing the political party to whom each contributes.

The roots of Jew-hatred and its causes have been analyzed in myriads of articles and books. I will add only two important factors here, common to the Arab-Muslim-Eastern world and the Western-European-Christian one:

1. Two religions, Christianity and Islam, are both daughter religions of Judaism and both developed "replacement theories" according to which both consider themselves the true religions replacing the defunct Judaism whose adherents are to be subjugated and humiliated under Christian and Muslim rule;

2. Jews lived in both these cultures among the nations and since Jews are "different" by definition, there are always many who hate them. The proof that these two factors – the religious and the realistic – are the basis of Jew-hatred is the fact that in three other cultures – Chinese, Japanese and Indian – who for our purposes can be seen as a control group- there is no Jew-hatred because:

- a. there is no connection between the local religions and Judaism and

- b. Jews did not live among the Chinese, Japanese and Indian peoples. Jews are therefore not seen as the "other who lives among us at our expense", and therefore are not hated.

Jew-hatred immigrated to the US from Europe long ago, but today its source is Islam and it is increasing as Islamic presence in public and political spheres becomes more pronounced. The number of Muslims in the US today is on the increase, while the number of US Jews is in constant decline. Most US Jews are liberals and over 70% vote Democrat, making them the target of those who hate the Democrats. Jews were at the center of the struggle for civil rights for Afro-Americans in the middle of the last century and can be found today in the forefront of public activism for accepting Syrian migrants, mainly Muslims. The American Right sees this Jewish activity in a negative light and as a result their demonstrations include the slogan "Jews will not replace us."

The growing hatred towards Jews is evident in worrying reports of a dramatic rise in the number of incidents where this hatred is expressed, the most shocking being shooting sprees: One, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on the Succot holiday this year, was the work of a murderer named Robert Bowers who broke into the Tree of Life Synagogue murdering 11 worshippers in cold blood and wounding six. The second happened this past Passover when a murderer named John Ernest broke into the Poway, California Chabad House, killed a worshipper and wounded three others. In both cases the perpetrators cited the anti-Jewish Turner Diaries written in 1978 by an American Nazi named William Luther Pierce who also writes under the pseudonym Andrew MacDonald.

Another factor casting a shadow on Jewish life in the USA is the strengthening of anti-capitalist concepts and negative opinions regarding "privileged," rich, healthy whites held by groups seen as underprivileged: people of color, the poor and handicapped. Jews are considered privileged and therefore an inseparable part of the "oppression and exclusion" system operated by the "privileged" against those "discriminated against" and "excluded" from the advantages available to the privileged groups.

More and more, as criticism of the policies it employs for self-defence increases, Israel is considered a burden by many American Jews. The very establishment of the Jewish State at the cost of the "unfortunate Palestinians" is in question. The challenge to Israel's right to exist because of it being a "colonialist entity" is prevalent in US Academic circles where for decades generations of students have been taught to believe with all their hearts that Jews have no right to a national home. Jews identifying with Israel on campus are subjected to criticism and hate speech from lecturers who threaten to affect their grades negatively and from peers who

threaten their safety.

It is imperative to mention the involvement of Jewish organizations in fanning the flames of this criticism as well as hatred for Israel: Jewish Voice for Peace, Peace Now, J Street, each in its own way and with its own methods. Activists in these organizations think that if only Israel would "act nicely" – according to their definitions of what that entails – to its neighbors, they – that is, the Jewish liberals and progressives – would be accepted more easily by American society. They do not realize the simple fact that Jew-hatred has nothing to do with Israel, was not born in 1948 but is deeply rooted in western culture, just as it is in Islamic culture.

The US was the Promised Land for Jews for many years. It was a land of immigrants where they could enjoy equal rights, respect and appreciation just like the other immigrants to its shores. It was also a safe haven - certainly in comparison with the security situation in Israel - a country where no one checks the bags of those entering a shopping center, train or bus station as they do in the Jewish State. However, the increase in Jew-hatred over the last few years has cast a pall on that feeling of security, and the murderous attacks targeting Jews in the past year have made the safe haven concept a shaky one. Many synagogues now have police protection during Sabbath and holiday prayers or during other activities that take place during the week.

A number of Jews have established an organization called Jews Can Shoot. Their kippahs are embroidered with the words: "Nothing Says Never Again Like an Armed Jew." Printed on the lining of the kippah is a saying by the Jewish Sages: "If someone is coming to kill you, rise against him and kill him first." There are Jews who come to the synagogue with a firearm, but is that going to solve the problem of Jew-hatred? And what exactly is the armed Jew going to do if the murderer carries an automatic weapon? What is going to happen if a group armed with automatic weapons attacks a synagogue where a single guard carrying a pistol is stationed outside? Is this scenario impossible to imagine?

I became aware of the massive change in the worldview of many US Jews during my lecture tour between Passover and Shavuot. The fear of encountering Jew hatred and terror attacks became a real possibility, an all-embracing undercurrent. The result is going to be the strengthening of two opposing trends: one, that Jews who do not feel a real connection to the Jewish collective are going to see that connection as an increasingly troublesome burden which they will try to make less visible as long as they can safely integrate totally into the surrounding society and be rid of the destiny facing US Jewry. In contrast, those Jews who will not or can not hide their identity (due to their clothes, side locks, beards and faith) will surround themselves with real or virtual walls in order to protect themselves and their congregations in Jewish neighborhoods (such as Williamsburg, Brooklyn) or towns (such as Monsey and Munroe). Others will reach the conclusion that French Jews reached over the past few years, give up life in America and move to Israel.

Israel's political system reflects the mindset of its population, with the right getting steadily stronger and the left weaker in a long term, continuous process. The political system in the United States, in contrast, is based on a kind of pendulum that sometimes grants the reins of power to Democrats like Carter, Clinton and Obama, and sometimes to the Republicans like Reagan, the Bush father and son and Trump. It is possible that after Trump – as a reaction to his way of thinking and behavior – the political pendulum will bring a radical leftist Jew like Bernie Sanders and his followers' liberal progressive agenda. That will bring the anti-Jewish feelings on the part of the American Right to new heights, but hopefully not their anti-Jewish actions. I do not see a way to return the anti-Jewish genie back to the bottle – and I am not so sure he was ever imprisoned there.

Twentieth century history teaches that the more Jews were integrated into the society in which they lived, the greater the threat they were perceived to pose to that society, therefore the greater the hatred they inspire. In pre-WWII Weimar Germany, Austria and Holland, Jews were on the highest socio-economic level, causing the Jew-hatred in those countries to be worse than that of Eastern European countries. Until recently, most American Jews felt that the US is intrinsically different than Europe that "it can't happen here." That feeling has begun to erode.

Israel must prepare itself to absorb massive aliya from the USA. This aliya will be the result of American Jewry reaching the conclusion that just as Europe, the USA has ceased to be a secure haven for Jews. Canada is not much better. And what is happening in Mexico, Argentina and Brazil, let alone Venezuela, will encourage many of the Jews in those countries to leave them and move to Israel. I believe that massive aliya from North, Central and South America is a matter of a few years at most, and the question Israel faces is what steps to take in order to absorb these future and blessed waves of immigration successfully.

(IsraelNationalNews.com Jun 17)