



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*

elimination. This is because for Beinart, the ongoing conflict is entirely the fault of Israeli Jews. The Palestinians' plight has nothing to do with their actions or decisions. They are unwitting pawns merely reacting to Israel's stratagems. Yet how is this outlook anything other than the

Commentary...

Beinart's Guilt Damns a Nation By Anat Talmy

Peter Beinart's two pieces—one in The New York Times and the other in Jewish Currents—are calling for the elimination of Israel as a Jewish state. Beinart no longer supports a two-state solution, but rather a binational state where Jews and Arabs share sovereignty in the territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River. This idea is ahistorical, unrealistic and holds Israel to an impossible standard and, if implemented, will likely lead to disaster.

Many Jews feel guilty for the plight of the Palestinians. Beinart's way of dealing with these feelings is by eliminating the Zionist project—one of the most amazing success stories of national revival in history. Discussing the elimination of an existing state is unprecedented. Israel is not an idea. It has existed for 72 years. No other country in the world is under such non-stop debate about its right to exist while it already does so.

Israel was built as a refuge state after the Holocaust and has served as such after many Jews were deported from Arab countries with nowhere else to go. Some of these deportees are still alive. Their descendants are thriving. Is it ethical, even reasonable, to suggest that their refuge state should lose its Jewish identity, their shield, and unite with an ethnic group with whom it has had a bloody conflict for many years in the name of peace?

There is no precedent for a successful reunification between two states entwined in a bloody conflict with different ethnicities and languages. Successful reunifications between East and West Germany or North and South Vietnam were possible because the people of those countries belonged to the same nationalities and were separated only by imperialistic circumstances. In fact, the trend in the last few decades among states with populations of people of different ethnicities, religions and languages is the dissolution of those states to several smaller ones. Examples include the former Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and the states that were created in the aftermath of ethnic conflicts, such as South Sudan and Kosovo.

Israel's neighboring countries provide further proof. Lebanon, Syria and Iraq all contain different ethnic groups that have been fighting for decades. These conflicts take place despite the groups' shared history, language and culture—elements not shared by Israelis and Palestinians. Even among the Palestinians, a conflict exists between Hamas in Gaza and the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank. It's unclear how adding Jews to the mix will create a peaceful coexistence in one state. Considering the hostility and distrust—not to mention the cultural, economic, political and social gaps between Jews and Palestinians—a civil war seems a more likely outcome.

Moreover, while many Israelis support the Palestinians' right for self-determination, as exemplified by the multitude of peace deals offered by the Israeli government representing them, what is the Palestinian objective? Beinart quietly omits the many times that Palestinian leaders rejected peaceful opportunities for resolution and statehood. Their leaders rejected the Peel Commission partition plan in 1937. They rejected the U.N. partition plan in 1947. They rejected former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak's offer of 94 percent of the disputed territories in 2001 and former Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert's more generous offer in 2006. Presently, Palestinian leaders reject even a peace negotiation. Their message is clear: There is no plan short of the end of Zionism (Israel) to which they would assent.

The Jewish state, like any other state in the world, is imperfect. However, Beinart fails to mention that the surrounding Arab and Muslim countries are even less perfect. These countries are, by and large, authoritarian and unfree, and make little effort to integrate their Palestinians, improve their conditions or offer them citizenship. Even in Tunisia, which Beinart marshals as a singular example of Arab democracy even though it has only existed since 2011, one must be Muslim to be president; Islamic education is mandatory in schools; homosexuality is criminalized; spousal rape is legal; corruption is rampant both in the government and among the police; property rights are scant; the judicial branch doesn't fully exist; the legislative branch is defunded; and the executive branch has declared a permanent state of emergency since 2015. But Beinart doesn't suggest dismantling any of these countries. Only his guilt drives him to hold Israel to an unattainable standard. Its inability to reach his bar implies its ultimate

racism of low expectations?

Perhaps most glaring, Beinart fails to discuss Jordan in his proposal. In Jordan, some 50 percent to 70 percent of the population is Palestinian. Wouldn't a one-state solution work better for the Palestinians in the West Bank and Jordan, who share language, religion, culture and even relatives, than in Israel where the Jews and Palestinians share distrust?

In presenting his solution, Beinart pushes many half-truths and inaccuracies to further his narrative. For example, "Israel is already a binational state. Two peoples, roughly equal in number, live under the ultimate control of one government." But Israeli Arabs represent only 20 percent of Israel's population. Beinart intentionally blurs the line between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, which has control over most of the Palestinians in the West Bank, because it serves his position; his solution is a few modifications away from reality.

Israel is surrounded by enemies and fair-weather allies. It finds few outspoken defendants among the countries of the world. And Jewish history, predating Israel's existence, is a tragic story riddled with pogroms and inquisitions. The fact that Holocaust analogies and references resurface in Jewish discussions is not an equation of Palestinians with Nazis, but rather an articulation of a simple truth: Jews do not feel safe. We feel safer because a Jewish state exists, but not nearly as safe as, say, a Frenchman or an American. Beinart's proposal to eliminate the Jewish state certainly doesn't help us feel safer.

At any rate, how does Beinart envision living together peacefully in a binational state when, by his own account, one side views the other as the ultimate evil? He hopes that Jews and Palestinians can peacefully coexist in a binational state where everyone's rights are protected. As such, Jews are expected to depend on their longtime enemies for safe haven. Palestinians, in turn, will happily share power with those from whom they've been trying to wrest it from and destroy for decades—a utopian experiment that, were it established, would likely prove catastrophic. (JNS Jul 20)

Indoctrinated with Hate: Palestinian Schools are Typical Muslim Schools By Raymond Ibrahim

A recent study examining nearly 400 textbooks and over 100 teachers' guides issued between 2013 and 2020 by the Palestinian Education Ministry found them to be rife with anti-Israel indoctrination.

According to the study's author, Dr. Arnon Groiss of the Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center, there are three aspects to this hate education:

- 1) Delegitimization of the State of Israel and the very presence of Jews in the Land of Israel, including the denial of the existence of Jewish holy places.
- 2) Demonization of Israel and the Jews.
- 3) Encouragement of "violent struggle" for the "liberation" of the Land of Israel, with no mention of peace and coexistence.

"In none of the P.A.'s schoolbooks has any call for the resolution of the conflict peacefully, or any mentioning of co-existence with Israel been found," writes Groiss. "The 'Zionist enemy,' according to the description appearing in the schoolbooks, is wholly evil and constitutes an existential threat to the Palestinians who are depicted as the ultimate victim, with no shared responsibility for the conflict," he adds.

According to an earlier report on the topic, also by Groiss, "Jews are demonized as well in the religious context, outside the context of the conflict. They are depicted as a corrupted nation from its very beginning and as enemies of Islam since its early days."

Citing the Koran and other Islamic scriptures, says Groiss, Palestinian textbooks teach that "the corruption of the Children of Israel on earth was and will be the reason of their destruction"; and that, though allied to them, the Islamic prophet Muhammad "was aware of the Jews' deceitfulness and conspiracies."

Moreover, "Islamic traditional ideals of Jihad and martyrdom are exalted and given a special role in the liberation struggle. In fact, there is one language exercise that specifically encourages martyrdom."

While indoctrinating schoolchildren to hate Jews may seem specific to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—that is, may appear to be a product of politics and grievances—it is, in fact, part of a broader trend: school textbooks in several other Muslim nations also teach hate for the “other”—even those who, far from being in a position to “oppress” Muslims are actually being oppressed by them.

For instance, in 2018, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom issued a statement saying that it “is disappointed to find inflammatory content in Saudi textbooks that was previously thought to have been removed.” The commission “uncovered content promoting violence and hatred toward religious minorities and others,” often in connection to the Islamic doctrine of “loyalty and enmity,” which, based on the Koran (e.g., Sura 60:4), requires Muslims to love what Allah loves and hate what Allah hates—which includes “infidels,” i.e., non-Muslims.

A separate report published by Human Rights Watch in 2017 touched on the indoctrination process: “As early as first grade, students in Saudi schools are being taught hatred toward all those perceived to be of a different faith or school of thought... The lessons in hate are reinforced with each following year.”

Further troubling is that such hate-filled texts are not limited to Saudi schools but continue to be widely disseminated to madrasas throughout the world, including in the United States.

Schools in Pakistan also continue to “teach their children to hate Christians and other religious minorities,” a 2017 report found: “Instead of minimizing hate materials and discouraging religious extremism [as the government had vowed to do after a particularly lethal Islamic terror attack on a school killed 132 students in 2014], the opposite seems to be occurring with a growing trend toward a more biased curriculum and more religious extremism being taught in Pakistan’s public schools.”

Speaking in 2019, a Pakistani Christian leader said that religious “minorities are considered infidels and they are depicted negatively in textbooks, which promote prejudices against minorities.”

Because of this, he said, “Many minorities give their children Islamic names so they will not be singled out as Christians and become potential targets for discrimination in primary or secondary schools or at the college level.... In many cases, minority students do suffer abuse in public schools.”

School textbooks in Turkey also demonize non-Muslims. Speaking of her experiences, a former Muslim woman who converted to Christianity explained how “her opinion of Christians was very low because of the things she and others were taught to believe about Christians in a Muslim society.” According to the woman, who now lives in the United States, “an anti-Christian attitude is a big part of the national identity [in Turkey], so anyone or anything that promotes Christianity is automatically suspicious.”

School textbooks taught her that “it was the Christians who wanted to plunder the lands and the riches of the Muslim world” and Turks merely responded by “defend[ing] what was rightfully theirs.” (In reality, modern Turkey consists of territory that was Christian for more than a millennium before being brutally conquered in the name of jihad.)

“Everything is used to make the Christians look like villains,” she said, adding, “It’s the same all through Muslim countries.”

And that’s the point—if Palestinian schoolchildren are being indoctrinated to hate Israel and Jews for “stealing their land” and generally oppressing them, what explains the fact that children throughout the Islamic world are also being indoctrinated to hate non-Muslims, particularly disenfranchised Christian minorities who, far from “lording” over Muslims, are currently being persecuted by them?

Indeed, hatred for religious minorities in Muslim countries actually helps explain why Israel is so reviled. If, as Muslim children are taught, infidels must always be at their feet—“Muslims are Jerusalem’s masters and no voice shall be higher than their voice [there],” Palestinian texts teach—surely only militant outrage will remain whenever Muslims find themselves under “infidel” authority. (JNS Jul 22)

Will the Democrats’ Generational Shift Turn the Tide Against Israel? By Jonathan S. Tobin

For pro-Israel Democrats, the only thing that matters about 2020 is that former Vice President Joe Biden is at the top of the ticket. They have good reason to celebrate the fact that he is less hostile to the Jewish state than the alternatives Democrats could have chosen to be their presidential nominee. But they still have to be concerned about whether the ranks of the anti-Israel radicals in the party will be strengthened in the next Congress.

The real question about the party’s future rests not only on whether Clinton and Obama administration veterans still yearning to

bash Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu shift policy farther away from the nation’s support of Israel if Biden wins in November. Rather, it is whether the ranks of the radical “Squad” of far-left members of the House of Representatives will not only increase, but also acquire the clout to offset the influence of an aging party establishment.

Biden will almost certainly bring the United States back into the disastrous Iran nuclear deal if he wins, though he also opposes aid cuts to the Jewish state. Along with his chief foreign-policy spokesman Anthony Blinken, the nominee has sought to reassure Jewish voters that they are cut from a very different cloth than the elements in their party that have adopted toxic intersectional rhetoric and back the BDS movement. But even those who are most confident about that understand that younger Democrats and the party’s grassroots activists don’t share their desire to maintain close relations with Israel.

That’s why political insiders have been closely monitoring a series of Democratic House primaries.

The first ominous indication that a generational shift away from pro-Israel moderates is occurring came in a crucial primary in New York that ended the career of Rep. Eliot Engel. The 16-term veteran was not only a stalwart supporter of Israel, but also chair of the House Foreign Relations Committee and in position to blunt any effort of party radicals, like Rep. Ilhan Omar (D-Minn.), to chip away at the Jewish state.

Jamaal Bowman, who was endorsed by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.), trounced Engel in his primary. Bowman, who says he wants to join AOC’s “Squad” of left-wingers in the House (assuming that it admits male members) doesn’t share the pro-BDS beliefs of two of the other members of that exclusive club—Omar and Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.)—though he’s probably more in agreement with their beliefs than Engel’s.

Engel’s defeat opens up a competition among Democrats for the chairmanship of a key committee for supporters of Israel. Among the leading contenders, they are probably rooting for Rep. Brad Sherman (D-Calif.), who is next in line in seniority on the committee. Sherman is to the left of Engel, but still a mainstream Israel supporter. Still, it’s far from certain he will succeed as chairman. Two minority members, Rep. Gregory Meeks (D-N.Y.) and Rep. Joaquin Castro (D-Texas), have also declared their interest, and it would be foolish to bet against either in the current atmosphere in which race dominates all discussions.

Of those two, pro-Israel activists would prefer Meeks, who is a member of the Democratic leadership. They have good reason to worry about Castro, who opened his campaign for the spot by saying, “Our foreign affairs committee needs to catch up with where Democrats are in terms of foreign policy ... too often Palestinian voices have been excluded.”

Still, some Democrats are hopeful that the ranks of “The Squad” will be thinned by primary challenges to both Omar and Tlaib.

Tlaib is the more vulnerable of the two, though the alternative is no bargain for Jewish voters. Tlaib, a Palestinian-American, advocates for Israel’s elimination and supports the anti-Semitic BDS movement. Her opponent—Detroit City Council member Brenda Jones—has ties to Nation of Islam leader and anti-Semitic hatemonger Louis Farrakhan, and may be just as hostile to Israel as Tlaib.

Omar is facing a challenge from Antone Melton-Meaux, who has raised millions from pro-Israel donors in an effort to defeat her. He is deeply critical of Israel’s government, though he opposes the BDS movement. While his fundraising shows just how desperate moderate Democrats are to knock off a House member who has engaged in anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist rhetoric, no one should count out Omar, who remains popular both among the younger contingent in Congress and at home, especially among the Somali community in Minnesota.

That’s not just because she’s as popular among Democratic activists as AOC in spite of making hateful statements that should have made her anathema among mainstream voters. The fact that the National Jewish Democratic Council is still dithering about whether or not to endorse her opponent with only two weeks before the primary shows that they probably think she’ll win. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who endorsed Omar this week, seems to share that conviction.

The last two years have shown that far from being ostracized, extremist anti-Semites like Omar and Tlaib are still considered Teflon rock stars by most Democrats. It’s also clear that they will gain more allies in the next Congress.

Is the possibility of a chair of the Foreign Relations Committee who’s more hostile to Israel, as well as more “Squad” members in the House, as important as what Biden will do? No. But it’s likely that the new generation of Democrats who are increasingly open to anti-

Israel arguments will still have more of a say on foreign policy than the shrinking faction of centrists would like.

The applause from some veteran Democratic foreign-policy wonks, like Robert Malley and Ben Rhodes, to Peter Beinart's recent anti-Zionist broadside in *The New York Times* shows that there is growing support for the positions embraced by Omar and Tlaib, even among those who may be running the State Department and the National Security Council if Biden wins.

It is not without reason that members of "The Squad" think they represent the future of the Democratic Party more than the veterans who are still supportive of Israel. What happens in November and the years that follow may show just how right they are—and how much of a disaster that will be for pro-Israel Democrats. (JNS Jul 23)

What is not 'Private Palestinian Land?' By Moshe Dann

In striking down the "Regulation Law," which legalized buildings which had been built on "disputed land," Israel's High Court of Justice accepted the view that the land in question was "privately" owned. The critical question is, however, what constitutes privately owned land? Are the claims valid, who makes this decision, and on what basis? The High Court did not explain.

If it is true that Jews are stealing land, this violates Jewish and Israeli laws and values and justifies calls for boycotts, sanctions and even the elimination of the state, since it applies to areas acquired after 1948 as well as in 1967. A devastating moral and legal indictment, it undermines Israel's moral foundation, its *raison d'être*.

Since most of the land in Judea and Samaria (the "West Bank") has not been registered, proving ownership is often difficult. Based on titles and deeds, land that is registered becomes private property, but what if there are no documents to prove ownership?

In many cases, land that Arabs claim as their private property was not purchased; it was State-owned land that was either given away during the Ottoman, British and Jordanian occupations, or was encroached upon and developed. Arab claims based on gifts and alleged agricultural uses are not property deeds. And what about claims of absentee owners living in enemy states whose land is under the control of the Custodian of Enemy Property? How then did this confusion about "private Palestinian land" come about?

Using ownerless, uninhabited land is a universally recognized method for claiming it, unless contested. Until the modern period, land registration especially in sparsely populated areas, like the Middle East, Africa and North Africa was not widely practiced. With the rise of nation-states and the development of bureaucracies this changed.

According to international agreements such as the San Remo Accord (1920), League of Nations (1922), the Mandate for Palestine was intended as a "Jewish National Home." This anchors the rights of the Jewish people and Israeli sovereignty in law. It has never been superseded and remains in force, despite Arab objections.

During the British Mandate, land surveys were made in Palestine, primarily to collect taxes and create an orderly system of land ownership and transfer. According to Dr. Dov Gavish, who wrote the only extensive study of this topic, *Survey of Palestine, 1920-1948* (2005), maps were drawn based on where inhabitants were found and on verbal claims, usually by local mukhtars (chieftains or village dignitaries) and sheikhs, not on documents or land registration.

Based on aerial photos and evidence of cultivation, villages were arbitrarily divided into large blocks of 600 dunams, which were then sub-divided among local peasants. Highly inaccurate, these fiscal maps nevertheless became the basis for taxation. They did not and do not reflect legal ownership.

As Gavish notes, the registration process lacked legal procedures for determining proper (actual) ownership, the investigators often had little professional training, surveyors who drew boundaries relied on inaccurate methods (such as vague geographical markers), and were hampered by constant Arab violence.

Maps and registration held by Turkish and Jordanian governments are not accessible, and many maps held by the British Mandatory government were "accidentally" destroyed. The Israeli Civil (Military) Administration also has aerial maps which are used to determine land use, and surveys which are not necessarily reliable or accurate documentations of private ownership.

These questionable maps and documents, however, are used to verify Arab claims and the basis of charging Jews with stealing "private Palestinian land." Although these lands could have been registered, most were not. Moreover, land which was not used, or not passed on by inheritance reverts to the original owner, the State, by law.

Most of what is called "private Palestinian land" is claimed – and some registered – based on policies that legitimized squatting after the fact and by counting land as "owned" when in fact it had been leased,

or simply used.

During the Mandatory period, most of the land that was registered by individuals was called "Miri." Leased, not privately owned, "Miri" land remained property of the State. Although land that was not used for ten years should have reverted to the State, large areas of such unused land remained under local Arab control.

Another category of ownerless land, called "waste land" ("Mewat"), is known throughout the Middle East and recognized in international law. Dr. Ya'akov Meron's authoritative article, "Waste Land (Mewat) in Judea and Samaria," (*Boston College Int'l & Comparative Law Review*, 1981) notes that this land was not included in State land and could be claimed by whoever used it, Jews or Arabs.

Because land on which most settlements are built is not agriculturally useful, Arabs did not claim ownership until recently, when anti-settlement NGOs asserted that these lands belonged to Arabs, individually and/or collectively, based on hearsay, maps and documents that are grossly inaccurate and often false.

In many cases, land claims are based on the "mukhtar protocol," where mukhtars decided land claims. As legal NGO Regavim's Naomi Kahn wrote: "In practice, the 'mukhtar protocol' spawned a massive industry of wholesale land giveaways and illegal land deals, forgery of documents and deeds, under-the-table payments, false testimony, and more. And it has created devastating results for the rightful owners of property, Arabs and Jews alike."

The High Court's opinion, therefore, that land is privately owned is not necessarily true unless essential documents have been examined and authenticated by lower courts. This was not done and it has led to much confusion about what constitutes "private Palestinian land."

Accusing Israeli Jews of "stealing private Palestinian land," is a powerful weapon used to demonize and delegitimize Israel and the settlement movement. Commonly accepted and taken for granted, these charges are used to justify Arab terrorism ("resistance") and subvert Israel's moral right to exist.

Such allegations, however, are inaccurate and fuel anti-Israel propaganda. Sadly, rather than clarify the issue, the High Court has confused it and sided with Israel's enemies. (Jerusalem Post Jul 18)

Does Israel's Government Chaos Mean Elections are Coming?

By Mati Tuchfeld

Israel's unity government has long since lost its public appeal, but now it is threatening to unravel completely. With government infighting breaking records on a daily basis and with a state budget nowhere in sight, the question of whether Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will trigger another general election has again been raised, but still has no definite answer.

One thing is clear: The prime minister has done nothing over the past few weeks to maintain the coalition. Instead, his Likud Party and coalition partner Blue and White have developed a culture of "penalizing" each other by supporting or opposing various legislative proposals presented by the respective coalition partners. Blue and White has also supported several bills presented by the opposition, leading to one thing: chaos in government.

The ultra-Orthodox parties Shas and United Torah Judaism are furious at this. They believe Netanyahu could easily keep Blue and White in check but chooses not to, and as far as they are concerned, the only reason for that is that Netanyahu wants to prompt general elections.

Shas and UTJ are not amused, to put it mildly.

Blue and White's decision Wednesday to side with the opposition and vote in favor of a bill banning gay conversion therapy may have been the last straw for the haredi parties.

Shas and UTJ's outcry over the vote had less to do with the bill itself and more to do with the fact that, once again, they realized that Blue and White is no one's bulwark.

The low-key conversion therapy bill, which had little chance of passing had Blue and White heeded coalition discipline, was thus turned from a dreary legislative proposal into the biggest political story of the week—and one that seemingly proved that the newfound public aversion to the government is justified.

The haredi parties were wary of a national unity government from day one and signed off on it over what can be described as election fatigue in the wake of three consecutive campaigns. For them, the coalition deal was akin to entering the political promised land.

Any cooperation between the haredi parties and Blue and White was rooted in mutual interest—mainly the desire to avoid early elections. They now find Netanyahu's ambiguity over whether he plans to call for a general vote very troubling.

Officials in both haredi parties said Wednesday that the damage Blue and White leader Defense Minister Benny Gantz has caused to their political relationship may be irreversible. Rolling back moves that have rendered Gantz untrustworthy will be virtually impossible, they said. (Israel Hayom Jul 23)

The Predicament of Liberal American Jews By Caroline Glick

In under a week, two events happened at The New York Times—the arbiter of liberal news and opinion—which highlight the growing precariousness of the American Jewish community's position in the Democratic Party.

On July 8, the Times published an op-ed by Peter Beinart, a far-left American Jewish writer and self-anointed spokesperson for liberal Jewish opinion on Israel.

Beinart's article, entitled, "I no longer believe in a Jewish state," argued that Israel no longer has a right to exist. It should be destroyed and replaced by a non-Jewish state. Beinart ended his article by urging American Jews to get over their Holocaust-induced fear of genocide and join him in his rejection of Jewish national rights.

To be clear, Beinart's position is anti-Semitic.

The Obama administration adopted the definition of anti-Semitism published in 2016 by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA). IHRA's definition includes a list of common manifestations of anti-Jewish bigotry. Among those manifestations are, "Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of the State of Israel is a racist endeavor."

Beinart's declaration that he has joined the jackals came as no surprise to those who had been paying attention. For the past decade, Beinart has been arguing that Israel's right to exist is contingent on its willingness to satisfy his American Jewish preferences. In his Times article, Beinart proclaimed that Israel is not delivering the goods. So as far as he is concerned, Israel needs to stop existing.

Beinart's advocacy of Israel's demise is significant not so much for what it says about American Jewish views of Israel (80 percent of American Jews support Israel and two-thirds feel an emotional attachment to the Jewish state), but for what it says about the political Left's view of Israel—and of Jews.

This is the case because for the better part of the past decade, Beinart has served as a weathervane of leftist opinion on Israel and Jews, and as a fig leaf for leftist anti-Semitism.

In 2012, Beinart began advocating on behalf of the campaign to boycott, divest and sanction Israeli Jewish businesses, institutions and communities in unified Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria (the West Bank), and products produced by Israeli Jews in those areas. His position earned him a prominent spot as the go-to Jew in the progressive camp.

Beinart's decision to move from boycotting some Israeli Jews and some parts of Israel to rejecting Israel's right to exist in any borders was not a function of a shift in liberal Jewish opinion. It was a reflection of the shift in opinion regarding Jews and the Jewish state on the political Left in America.

This is a tragedy for the American Jewish community. According to a 2018 survey by the Jewish Federations of North America, 50 percent of American Jews define themselves as liberals. In 2019, Pew found that 64 percent of American Jews identify with the Democratic Party.

To get a sense of just how inhospitable the political Left and the Democratic Party have become to liberal, pro-Israel American Jews, it is worth considering the source Beinart furnished to present his bigoted view as an expression of progressive opinion in America.

Beinart linked to a survey of U.S. opinion of Israel and the Palestinians conducted in 2018 by Shibley Telhami at the University of Maryland. The survey found that 42 percent of Americans aged 18 to 34 support Israel's destruction and replacement with a non-Jewish state. 55 percent of Democrats (and 19 percent of Republicans) believe the Israeli government has too much influence on U.S. politics and policies.

According to the IHRA definition of anti-Semitism, "Making...stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as a collective" is a manifestation of anti-Semitism. By asserting that Israel exerts undue influence over U.S. politics and policies, 55 percent of Democrats (and 19 percent of Republicans) were channeling an anti-Semitic conspiracy theory. And 42 percent of young Americans have embraced the main pillar of contemporary anti-Semitism: the racist rejection of the Jewish people's right to national self-determination.

This brings us to the second major event that occurred at The New York Times with dire implications for the American Jewish

community: the July 14 resignation of pro-Israel staff op-ed editor and writer Bari Weiss. Among other things, in her letter of resignation, Weiss discussed the anti-Semitic harassment she suffered at the hands of her colleagues.

In her words, "My own forays into Wrongthink have made me the subject of constant bullying by colleagues who disagree with my views. They have called me a Nazi and a racist; I have learned to brush off comments about how I'm 'writing about the Jews again.'"

Like Beinart, Weiss has spent the past several years adapting to the Left's rising hostility to Israel and to Jews. Unlike Beinart, Weiss has not coped by embracing the hatred. Instead, she has sought to negotiate with the Left to secure a space for Jewish rights on the political Left.

Weiss' bargain was fairly cut and dry. She served as a spokesperson for the allegation that President Donald Trump is the enabler-in-chief of white nationalist anti-Semitism. And in exchange, she sought the right to criticize anti-Semitism on the Left, as she did, to the indignation of progressives, in an August 2017 column describing the anti-Semitism of the leaders of the Women's March against Trump.

Weiss did her best to uphold the bargain she hoped to make. She distinguished herself as a major voice castigating Trump in the aftermath of the massacre of Jewish worshippers at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh in October 2018. Appearing on the "Real Time with Bill Maher" show days after the slaughter, Weiss effectively accused Trump of partial culpability for the massacre, despite the fact that it was carried out by an anti-Trump white nationalist who opposed the president precisely because he is not an anti-Semite.

In her words, Trump was guilty of "inculcating an atmosphere of conspiracy-minded thinking" which, she alleged, incited the murderer to kill elderly Jews.

In 2019, Weiss used the Tree of Life massacre as the basis of a book called, *How to Fight Anti-Semitism*.

Weiss presented her book as a taxonomy of anti-Semitism in America and a guide for Jews to stand up for themselves. But more than a summation and guide, it was a case study of the liberal Jewish predicament in contemporary America.

Weiss reinstated her attacks on Trump as an enabler of white nationalist anti-Semitism in America. As she put it, "In the nearly three years he has been in office, Donald Trump has trashed—gleefully and shamelessly—the unwritten rules of our society that have kept American Jews, and, therefore, America safe."

The unfairness of her condemnations of Trump became clear when they were compared to her analysis of anti-Semitism in her own political and ideological camp.

Trump has never had much of anything to do with white nationalist anti-Semites—or any anti-Semites, for that matter. The worst he can be fairly accused of is not always rushing to distance himself from them, and of using indelicate language to describe his admiration for and affinity towards American Jews.

In contrast, former president Barack Obama spent 25 years in the pews of anti-Semitic pastor Jeremiah Wright. During his presidency, Obama had Al Sharpton over to the White House more than 80 times. Obama demonized and attacked Israel and its Jewish supporters while emboldening anti-Semites in the U.S. and worldwide.

But Weiss' criticism of Obama was rare, apologetic and mild. And she gave a pass to other Democratic leaders. Weiss described progressive anti-Semitism as real and dangerous, but she tread cautiously around the big fish.

Weiss' rush to present Trump as the enabler-in-chief of white nationalist anti-Semitism and her careful, almost clinical description of anti-Semitism in her own political camp, was an expression of the bargain she sought to strike with the Left.

Weiss' letter of resignation, replete with its description of the anti-Semitic ostracism she suffered at the hands of her progressive colleagues at the Left's newspaper of record, makes clear that she had no partner for her bargain. Today, the American Left is not interested in making any deals; not with her, and not with the liberal Jews she emblemizes. The modern American Left is not willing to combat or disavow anti-Semitism of any kind, unless it can be attributed to Donald J. Trump, Public Enemy Number One.

In the current environment, the only Jews who are welcome at the Times—and through it—in the progressive camp and the progressive-dominated Democratic Party are those who maintain a frightened silence, or Jews like Beinart who are willing to promote anti-Semitic positions "as Jews." (Newsweek July 23)
