



Jerusalem 7:07  
Toronto 8:41

## 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*

**Why Didn't  
Hezbollah Join Iran  
in the War Against Israel**  
By Tal Beer

During the course of the Israel-Iran war known as "Rising Lion," which took place from June 13 to June 24, 2025, Hezbollah chose not to engage

militarily alongside Iran against Israel. This decision held even as Israel maintained its parallel offensive strategy of "mowing the lawn" — consistently targeting Hezbollah's infrastructure and operatives within Lebanon.

Why did Hezbollah refrain from joining?

The prevalent (and popular) answer to this question is based on two claims:

The first claim is based on the internal Lebanese aspect — due to the pressure of the social, political, and economic climate within Lebanon, a climate in which Hezbollah is seemingly currently in a less comfortable and less enabling situation in Lebanon.

The second claim is based on the external aspect vis-à-vis Israel — "Hezbollah's restraint" is attributed by some to a state of deterrence induced by the outcome of its conflict with Israel, which concluded in a ceasefire on November 27, 2024. This perceived deterrence is further reinforced by Israel's ongoing and consistent offensive operations against the group.

Are these really the reasons for Hezbollah not joining Iran in the war?

The internal aspect indeed exists. However, in our understanding, the claim based on it gives it excessive weight in the context of Hezbollah's status and decision-making. In our assessment, there is a large gap between the existing presentation of Hezbollah's supposed weakness and the actual reality.

The civil growth engine of Hezbollah — the "Resistance Society," Hezbollah's Shi'ite base, which is a "captive audience" (religiously-ideologically, economically-dependent, and fear-based) continues to be maintained and supported by Hezbollah's broad civilian infrastructure. This infrastructure is managed by the Executive Council and functions in parallel to the collapsing and non-functioning Lebanese state infrastructure. Admittedly, there are quite a few financial difficulties for the purpose of civilian reconstruction, difficulties that may intensify in light of the war's outcomes with Iran, but it is still a functioning infrastructure. This is a very significant aspect of Hezbollah's survivability.

In practice, Hezbollah, if and when, can be effectively influenced only by the climate pressure of the Shi'ite base. Is it currently a significant pressure? The answer is no — mainly due to the aforementioned "captive audience" principle. The general climate pressure in Lebanon (coming from other religions and sects in Lebanon) does not, in our understanding, effectively influence Hezbollah's decisions, despite there being those who try to describe it as such.

The claim that Hezbollah is deterred creates a dangerous illusion and takes us back to the days before October 7, 2023.

On November 20, 2024, about a week before the ceasefire, Ibrahim Al-Amin — editor-in-chief of the Al-Akhbar newspaper, Hezbollah's main mouthpiece — wrote that "the current confrontation (Hezbollah's fighting against Israel that began on October 8, 2023) is just another round in the war against Israel which must be destroyed, and for this purpose, Hezbollah will act to restore its capabilities and re-empower itself..."

This sentence is, in fact, the essence of Hezbollah's core ideology: there is no peace. There are no compromises. There is one ideology, and it is continuous armed resistance. Hezbollah's core — armed resistance — is not a means, but an identity. Hezbollah is here to stay. Hezbollah's ideological commitment to armed resistance and its objective of Israel's destruction remains unchanged..

The rifle on Hezbollah's flag — is not a decoration. It is a statement.

The concept of "deterrence" holds no real meaning within the

## Commentary...

**Living in Biblical Times** By Abe Greenwald

The 16 months since Israel was attacked by those who sought to destroy it on October 7, 2023, have been so full of heartache, consequence, and, ultimately, Jewish triumph that one can't help but consider the hand of God in it all. At least, I can't.

Israel's multifront defensive war against its enemies carries biblical resonances, beginning with the events of October 7 itself. The Hebrew Bible tells of Amalek, Israel's eternal and irreconcilable enemy who ambushed the weakest of the Israelites again and again. The nation of Amalek, however, was never entirely destroyed. While it's not useful to invoke Amalek whenever an enemy of the Jews raises his head, it makes perfect sense that Benjamin Netanyahu did so after the Hamas massacre of October 7 and before the IDF launched its ground invasion of Gaza. "You must remember what Amalek has done to you, says our Holy Bible," Bibi remarked. "And we do remember."

So Israel—like the Israelites of the Bible—short on allies and abundant in enemies, fought for its existence, won, remade the Levant, and secured its future in God's creation.

How many of Israel's post-October 7 successes seem like miracles? The beeper and radio plots against Hezbollah, the killing of Ismail Haniyeh in Tehran, the decimation of Hezbollah leadership, the destruction of Hezbollah arms and Iranian air defenses, the robust Israeli defense against missile barrages, the hostage rescues, the shattering of Hamas, the budding relationship with a new Syria, and the U.S.-Israeli airstrikes on Iran's nuclear program. On October 8, 2023, any one of these would have seemed too miraculous to dare hope for.

There are also the lesser-known miracles during this time. Just take the case of Omer Shem Tov, a 20-year-old kidnapped from the Nova music festival into the Hamas tunnels of Gaza. For nearly a month, Shem Tov heard Israeli tanks overhead and hoped that his rescue was imminent. But the tanks moved on. His captors went to retrieve whatever the IDF might have left behind, and they brought him back some papers written in Hebrew. Thinking the material was military-related, they asked Shem Tov to translate for them. But what they had brought him was a Chabad pamphlet on that week's Torah portion about Joseph being thrown into a pit, sold, imprisoned, and finally being freed and appointed as Pharaoh's second in command. Shem Tov negotiated with his Hamas guards to keep it, as it was the sudden source of a religious faith he had not previously had. He remained a prisoner for more than a year, reading and rereading from Genesis 39:

20 And Joseph's master took him, and put him into the prison, a place where the king's prisoners were bound: and he was there in the prison.  
21 But the LORD was with Joseph, and shewed him mercy, and gave him favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison.

Shem Tov was released this February.

Stories like that, and, indeed, Israel's entire war, are a reminder that the Hebrew Bible isn't merely a guide to life 3,000 years ago but a guide to the world as it is. This includes the fact that the enemies of the Jews will keep coming at us, and we will, with God's guidance, destroy them. For Jews continue to live in biblical times, even as they change the present and shape the future. (Commentary.org Jul 8)

worldview of an ideologically driven, religious extremist organization such as Hezbollah (and similarly, Hamas).

Hezbollah's decisions regarding any military/terrorist activity and the initiation of war are made based on a religious directive. Any relevant interest (in our case, the interest of reconstruction) is a strengthening parameter for decision-making.

In our assessment, no religious directive was issued for Hezbollah to join the war on Iran's side against Israel. Indeed, as reported, there were apparently Iranian pressures on Hezbollah to join – at the operational-military level – but the religious directive was slow to come. It did not come from the “Wilayat al-Faqih” (Guardianship of the Islamic Jurist), i.e., the Supreme Leader in Iran and the current leader of Hezbollah did not issue such a directive.

A strengthening interest for Hezbollah's non-joining on Iran's side is the reconstruction interest, mainly in its military aspect. Hezbollah needs time. Hezbollah needs “reconstruction quiet.” Therefore, its interest is not to cause significant escalation with Israel that would severely harm its reconstruction interest. In our assessment, in Hezbollah's risk management, the current situation of Israeli “mowing the lawn” is a situation that can be tolerated and in which reasonable reconstruction can still be managed.

We do not know why the religious directive did not arrive and whether the possibility of issuing such a directive was considered. But had the religious directive come, Hezbollah would have joined the war on Iran's side. In such a case, the popular claims about internal Lebanese pressure on Hezbollah and that “Hezbollah is deterred” would have collapsed.

Indeed, Israel damaged Hezbollah's military capabilities very severely – but did not crush them.

As of this writing, it seems that despite the difficulties and challenges facing Hezbollah (which may even intensify following the war's results with Iran), Hezbollah's processes of reconstruction and military force build-up are in full swing. It may even be that the economic resources that still exist are primarily directed to this purpose – even at the expense of civilian reconstruction concerning the Shi'ite base, which is a “captive audience” in any case.

Hezbollah's various units are actively reconstructing and modifying their operational plans, recalibrating their strategic approach, restoring military capabilities, and laying the groundwork for potential terrorist operations against Israel—both from within Lebanese territory and abroad. In our assessment, Hezbollah's relevant units can currently, at any given moment, carry out activity against Israel.

Given the order (the religious directive), Hezbollah could, in our assessment, have joined the war on Iran's side – both in terms of arsenal redundancy and in terms of operational-military capability. (Alma Research Jul 3)

---

## **Not Everyone Should Sit at the Communal Table**

By Cheryl Dorchinsky

Zionism is the unwavering support for a Jewish state in its ancestral homeland. It is the recognition that, as the indigenous people of Israel, Jews have the right to live in peace and security without denying the rights of others. It is not about exclusion. It's about survival, dignity and self-determination after thousands of years of persecution and exile.

Every few years, the World Zionist Congress, the legislative body for the World Zionist Organization, gives Jewish communities worldwide the power to choose their representatives. These representatives will have access to billions of dollars that shape the future of Israel and the global Jewish community.

Billions. Let that sink in.

So why are groups that actively undermine Israel's security, who lobby the U.S. government to withhold weapons in Israel's hour of need, who stand with those chanting “From the river to the sea,” and who fight against the Antisemitism Awareness Act meant to protect Jews everywhere given a seat at the table? Why are organizations like J Street, which openly take money from those hostile to Israel, given a platform and a share of these critical resources?

I sent a letter to the chairman of the World Zionist Organization, Yaakov Hagoel, with a simple request:

“Please consider accepting this resolution at the WZO to block the participation of any party that seeks to undermine Israel's ability to defend itself against hostile entities that openly call for its destruction. J Street is currently engaged in such activities, posing a significant threat to our collective security.”

I received no response.

Israel is not a political pawn, and asking that those who oppose it not be able to participate in the WZO is a matter of human rights, of life and death. J Street and its allies have hijacked the conversation, spreading misinformation, standing with those who call for violence and putting Jewish communities at risk. Zionism is not about enabling those who seek our destruction. There are many ways to love and support Israel, but undermining its security and safety is not one of them.

I may not agree with every group's strategy, but I respect those who put Israel's security first. J Street, by contrast, takes money from left-wing billionaire George Soros, opposes the globally recognized International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's working definition of antisemitism and lobbies against Israel's interests, even as its members run for control of billions of dollars meant for our people's future.

Why are those whose actions harm us given access to these resources? Israel deserves better. The Jewish people deserve better. It's time for real leadership. We need leaders who will call out and reject groups that undermine our safety, regardless of their members' religion or politics.

When members of Atlanta's mainstream Jewish community stood up to voice our disapproval of our senators' votes against supporting Israel, J Street rushed to provide cover for the anti-Israel narrative, claiming to speak for “the Jewish community.” They do not speak for the majority of us. They do not represent our values. I don't care about their words; I care about their actions.

We cannot allow our community to be hijacked by those who spread misleading political propaganda and endanger our future. The WZO and mainstream Jewish leadership must take a stand. Enough is enough. The time for silence is over. The time for courage and clarity is now. (JNS Jul 9)

---

## **How Anti-Zionism Became a Western Rite** By Jacob Howland

It's official: Jew hatred is trending among millennials and older Gen Z. On June 28, the rapper Bobby Vylan's chants of “Death, death to the IDF” were broadcast by the BBC and enthusiastically echoed by tens of thousands of people in the live audience of 200,000 at the Glastonbury Festival, many of whom were waving Palestinian flags. “Hell yeah, from the river to the sea,” intoned the aptly named Vylan, “Palestine must be, will be, inshallah, it will be free!” Vylan's performance was a coda to Zohran Mamdani's June 24 victory in the Democratic primary for mayor of New York, a city with the largest population of Jews (1.3 million) outside of Tel Aviv. Mamdani—who supports the boycott, divest, sanctions movement, has expressed his “love” for convicted funders of Hamas, and has defended calls to “globalize the intifada”—got 52 percent of the under-45 vote among primary voters.

Many of Vylan's fans and Mamdani's base of young, white, college-educated, and affluent voters would doubtless agree that “there is only one solution, intifada, revolution!” But what problem is this globalized intifada intended to solve? Evidently, it's not just Israel, but also the West, whose foundational values and successes the Jewish state epitomizes. The “solution,” therefore, is not simply to cleanse the land of Jews “from the river to the sea” but also to eradicate Western civilization.

Open hatred of Jews flourishes in periods of societal instability and license, when the decency and decorum that protects them from assault by their fellow citizens is suspended. The claim that Jews killed Christian children to use their blood in the preparation of Passover matzoh offered an excuse to torture and murder whole communities from the 12th century until at least 1946, when 42 Jews

were slaughtered for it in Kielce, Poland. Today, the “blood libel” is back in a new form: the allegation that Israel is targeting Gazans, particularly children, for genocide. Propagated by people who inwardly despise Christianity’s moral and spiritual teachings, including far-right antisemites, this malicious falsehood has fueled widespread indignation and outrage in the West. Some have taken matters into their own hands, targeting Jews for violence wherever they may be found.

Recent events show an accelerating pattern of accusation and attack. On May 20, the under-secretary-general for humanitarian affairs at the United Nations issued an urgent warning during an interview with the BBC: “There are 14,000 babies [in Gaza] that will die in the next 48 hours unless we can reach them” with humanitarian aid. Although this absurd claim was swiftly debunked, it immediately went viral and was spread far and wide by mainstream media in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. High-profile figures, like the journalist Katie Couric, who has 1.6 million followers on X, reposted it. The next day, a couple that worked at the Israeli Embassy, Yaron Lischinsky, 30, and Sarah Milgrim, 26, were executed outside the Capital Jewish Museum in Washington, D.C., by a man who told police, “I did it for Palestine. I did it for Gaza.” A few days later, on June 1, an Egyptian man shouting “They are killers! How many children you killed?” firebombed marchers in Boulder, Colorado, who were advocating for the release of Israeli hostages. He injured 15 people, including a Holocaust survivor. One of the victims, 82-year-old Karen Diamond, has died from her injuries.

The blood libel expresses ugly emotions of envy and hatred buried in the deep recesses of the psyche. How could a people slated for extermination since the time of Moses still walk the earth? The Book of Exodus answers that the people of Israel are favored by the divine might of a loving God. In his letter to the Romans, Paul, too, affirms God’s love for the Jews. Jew haters, however, invert this relationship, comparing Jews to blood-sucking insects or vampires—subhuman and inhuman parasites, so far from divine favor as to be utterly demonic.

Moreover, the blood libel perverts a foundational religious practice of Judaism and Christianity that commemorates God’s loving sustenance. Passover matzoh recalls the “bread of affliction” that was the hurried fare of the fleeing Israelite slaves, the unleavened bread God instructed them to prepare in their flight to freedom. It is what Jesus held in his hand at the Passover seder that was the Last Supper, thereby birthing the ritual that binds Christians with one another and with a God who saves and redeems. In celebrating the spilled blood and broken bodies of Jews, the motley assembly of antisemites has replaced God’s bond with a modern-day pagan cult.

The scapegoating of Jews in the West is part and parcel of a barbarized culture, one that endorses political violence. A recent Rutgers University poll found that “55 percent of all self-identifying ‘liberals’ believe killing is a justifiable means of pursuing their political goals”—and endows it with theological significance. If George Floyd’s death and subsequent canonization as a secular martyr justified the urban riots during which 2,000 police officers were injured, thousands of businesses and properties were looted and vandalized, and 17 people were killed, the sanctification of cold-blooded murder soon followed. After Luigi Mangione allegedly gunned down UnitedHealthcare CEO Brian Thompson in 2024, images appeared of Mangione with a halo, in a green mantle with a red sacred heart, under the title “Saint Luigi, Patron Saint of Healthcare Access for All.”

These developments underscore the global convergence of militant political and religious movements. Islamists have learned to speak the language of social justice activists, while far-left radicals have learned to frame ideological struggle as a holy war. Human life holds little value for either of them. The journey from self-immolation for Palestine to so-called self-martyrdom bombings is a short stop or two on a train that long ago left the station of peaceful politics.

The ultimate aim of those who have married Islamism and Marxism, as Columbia University Apartheid Divest (a group of more than 100 anti-Israel organizations) admitted, is “the total eradication of Western civilization.” That would mean a world without political and economic liberty, freedom of speech and opinion, equal rights for

women and minorities, technological advancement, philosophy, science, art, literature, music, and the blessings of the Jewish and Christian traditions.

The hatred of Israel and the Jews is at bottom a nihilistic loathing of the free and flourishing life that the West has secured for billions of people. Israel epitomizes not only the abundant fruits of Western civilization but also the conditions for their existence: strong borders, national pride, and free markets; thick social bonds and vigorous common purpose. These conditions are much maligned (particularly in the case of the Jewish state) because they impede any sort of political or religious globalization, be it of socialism, Islamism, or elite technocratic rule. While there’s no changing the minds of hard-core antisemites, Westerners who subject Israel and its people to withering criticism because they are inclined to support one or more of these causes would do well to ponder this biblical instruction: “Life and death I set before you, the blessing and the curse, and you shall choose life so that you may live, you and your seed” (Deuteronomy 30:19). (Tablet Jul 1)

---

### **Worldwide Diplomatic Isolation is Better than More Dead Jews**

By Jonathan S. Tobin

Even Israel’s most severe and unfair critics have to acknowledge two things. One is that since the Hamas-led Palestinian Arab terrorist attacks in southern Israeli communities on Oct. 7, 2023, the strategic situation in the Middle East has been substantially altered in favor of the Jewish state. The other is that although Israel has become extremely unpopular around the globe and even lost favor with many Americans as a result of the war with Hamas in Gaza post-Oct. 7, most Israelis value their security over the opinions of spectators to their struggles.

This is hard for Western liberals and leftists to understand. And yet, it points to a profound truth about the dilemma of Jewish life in the 21st century—and every one of them throughout the last two millennia. The choice facing Israel and the Jewish people is clear: If they refuse to let themselves be slaughtered and their state demolished, then they’re going to be mightily judged by a double standard applied to no other nation or people on the planet.

The Zionist movement and Israelis have, for entirely understandable and often correct reasons, always downplayed the cost of victory amid the fight for survival in terms of international opinion. No matter how unfair the charges, the branding of this nation of fewer than 10 million as a pariah state is no small matter.

Nevertheless, the puzzlement about the fact that Israelis prefer to be live pariahs rather than a fondly remembered people to be memorialized is nothing more than just the latest example of what author Dara Horn memorably pointed out in her 2021 collection of essays, *People Love Dead Jews*.

Largely due to biased coverage of the post-Oct. 7 war on the part of the international media as well as mainstream U.S. outlets like The New York Times and CNN, many, if not most, people on the political left in Europe and America have started to believe the pro-Hamas propaganda about Israel being guilty of “genocide” in Gaza. They are also apparently astounded by the indifference of its citizens to the fact that a great many of the supposedly enlightened and educated people in the West think that they are very bad. And they similarly dismiss friends of Israel who dispute these false charges.

The Times attempted to explain this conundrum with a “news analysis” titled, “The Cost of Victory: Israel Overpowered Its Foes, but Deepened Its Isolation,” by White House correspondent Michael Shear. The article seeks to contrast the growing hostility to the Jewish state with a fairly solid consensus inside Israel about the necessity to defeat and remove Hamas in Gaza, Hezbollah in Lebanon and Iran’s nuclear threat.

But buried in the 12th paragraph is a statement presented as something of a great insight into the thinking of an Israeli people, depicted as largely clueless about their image abroad. After summarizing how disliked the Jewish state has become and the way a bipartisan pro-Israel consensus in the United States has collapsed, the piece puts forward the following conclusion, a rare instance of the

paper reporting something unquestionably true about the conflict in the Middle East: “Many Israelis welcome the prospect of a future in which they are no longer surrounded by well-armed enemies determined to do them harm, even if it means being viewed negatively by the rest of the world.”

What rational citizen of any country would think differently?

The self-evident answer is none. But somehow, Israelis are portrayed as an insular and heartless people because they support removing existential threats in the form of genocidal Islamist terrorist movements such as Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis and their Iranian paymasters.

The Times goes on to argue that the cost of the defeat of those foes in the last 21 months cannot be worth the price of global opprobrium, in addition to the bitter feelings of Palestinian Arabs and their supporters, who are disappointed that the conflict has turned against them after having committed the largest slaughter of Jews since the Holocaust.

The newspaper is right that Israel’s victories in Gaza, Lebanon, Syria and Iran have come at a cost—and by that, they don’t mean the nearly 900 soldiers in the Israel Defense Forces who have fallen in the battle for their nation’s survival. There is no question that the vituperation against Israel and Zionism, as well as open antisemitism, has surged since Oct. 7. This took the form of pro-Hamas mobs who took over the streets of cities around the world and on North American college campuses.

In Europe, examples of mass outbursts of anti-Israel invective are no longer confined to political forums or the press. They have become routine happenings at cultural events that have nothing to do with the debate about the Middle East, such as the Glastonbury music festival in England, where, along with one of the performing bands, crowds recently chanted “Death to the IDF!” Similar vitriol was apparent at the annual running of the bulls at Pamplona, Spain, where a huge banner proclaiming “destroy” Israel was unfurled while organizers allowed activists to take over the ceremony.

Such histrionics aside, the effort to diplomatically sanction and economically isolate it does hurt Israel, as well as making it more difficult for its citizens to travel or do business abroad. The status as an international pariah, coupled with the hostility of organizations like the United Nations, and that coming from European and American left-wingers, remains a problem. Still, perhaps only readers of the Times would consider it such a terrible fate that it ought to prompt Israelis to reassess their nation’s successful struggle for survival and security.

In his 1989 book, *From Beirut to Jerusalem*, Times columnist Thomas L. Friedman memorably wrote that Israel could best be described as “Yad Vashem with an air force.” He did not mean this reference to Israel’s national Holocaust museum and memorial as a compliment.

Friedman viewed the Jewish state’s concern for its security in a region where its neighbors had been working toward its annihilation from the moment of its modern-day establishment in 1948 as the obsession of a nation of delusional paranoids.

In the decades since, Friedman has posed as a foreign-policy expert even as events proved him wrong over and over again. Like most of his readers, he considers the fact that the Palestinian Arabs have rejected peace offers and far-reaching Israeli concessions, such as those ceded in the 1993 Oslo Accords, the 2000 Camp David summit, the 2005 disengagement from Gaza and other negotiations, as meaningless.

And that is the point that the Times analysis of the cost-benefit ratio of Israeli victory in exchange for calumnies and isolation misses.

All of these peace offers and territorial concessions have been disasters. Israel didn’t—as its once dominant left-wing political parties proclaimed—exchange “land for peace.” What they’ve done is to trade land for terrorism.

That is not only because efforts to make peace didn’t succeed. Rather, it’s that every tangible concession has been used by the Palestinians and the terror groups that they have chosen to lead them to continue their century-old war against the presence of Jews in their ancient homeland.

The extremism and violence that plagued Israel in the 1990s after

allowing the Palestine Liberation Organization to set itself up as an autonomous government in Judea, Samaria and Gaza would have been impossible without Oslo. The same is true of the Second Intifada, which followed the Jewish state’s offer of an independent Palestinian state in 2000 that cost more than 1,000 Israeli lives.

The incessant rocket fire from Israel from Gaza since Hamas turned it into a terrorist fortress in 2007—and then the horrors of Oct. 7—could not have happened if not for former Prime Minister Ariel Sharon’s 2005 decision to withdraw every Israeli soldier, settler and settlement as part of a disastrous effort to advance the peace process.

To Israelis and their supporters, the recitation of the history of these failed peace efforts is old news. Few bother even to cite it as they fend off fallacious charges of genocide and apartheid that so many foreign observers have swallowed hook, line and sinker.

If Israelis are indifferent to international opinion, it’s not just because the Zionist ethos has created a spirit that saw the accomplishments of the Jews as more important than what the world thought of them. It’s because, unlike their critics, they know that they’ve taken risks for peace and paid for them not only in bad press clippings but in oceans of blood.

It’s possible that a great many otherwise decent people simply don’t know the history of the conflict. But the real problem today is that under the influence of indoctrination in the toxic left-wing myths of critical race theory, intersectionality and settler-colonialism, a great many others don’t care about the facts. They believe that Israelis and Jews are “white” oppressors who are always in the wrong, and the Palestinians are “people of color” who are always in the right. There is no convincing them of the truth under any circumstances.

Unlike most populations, who have no conception or sense of their own mortality as a group, Israelis and Jews understand what it means to be faced not only with fanatics who seek their deaths but the very real possibility that they may succeed. The Thomas Friedmans of the world can mock the idea that a Holocaust that happened 80 years ago should influence the policies of a country that has become a regional superpower with a First World economy.

But the mass murder, torture, rape, kidnapping and wanton destruction that took place on Oct. 7 was Hamas putting its genocidal ideology into action. The killing of 1,200 Israelis—the worst mass slaughter of Jews since the Holocaust—and the kidnapping into Gaza of 250 others was just the trailer for what the Palestinian Arabs intend for the rest of Israel. If Iran invested massive resources over decades into an effort to build a nuclear weapon that has hopefully been thwarted by last month’s American and Israeli airstrikes, it was because it wants a bomb with which it can inflict a new Holocaust on the Jews.

Any discussion of the cost that Israel is being made to pay for its successful efforts to degrade and eliminate the threats against its population from Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran cannot ignore the alternative to military success and the attendant casualties suffered by civilians in Gaza being used as human shields.

Yet that is exactly what Western liberals and leftists are doing.

Israelis will continue to debate the best way to protect their security, as well as whether their leaders and the military have succeeded in achieving their objectives. Anyone who thinks that they should choose policies that put their lives at risk to avoid being falsely accused of genocide knows nothing of Jewish history or the reality of the Middle East. The Jews need a state and the ability to defend themselves far more than the good opinion of the multitudes that didn’t wait until the bodies of the Oct. 7 victims were buried to start sympathizing with the murderers. Remember: The IDF didn’t start operations in Gaza until three weeks later, long after the first mass rallies spewed chants of “Free Palestine,” “From the river to the sea” and “Globalize the intifada.”

There have already been enough dead Jews. It’s time for decent people to understand that the willingness of living ones to defend themselves is something not only to be understood, but to be supported. (JNS Jul 8)