



Jerusalem 7:01
Toronto 8:30

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*

בס"ד

Commentary...

Kudos to the Knesset for Supporting Sovereignty By Ruthie Blum

Israelis who live on a diet of anti-government slant fed to them by most of the Hebrew media missed a crucial report on Wednesday. Busy focusing on fake news about widespread famine in Gaza and the resumption of haredi-draft-bill negotiations (falsely referred to by the left the "haredi exemption bill"), these hostile outlets didn't see fit to mention that the Knesset passed a resolution to apply Israeli sovereignty to Judea, Samaria and the Jordan Valley.

Though the resolution is non-binding, which means that it's more declaratory than concrete at the moment, the fact that it passed by an overwhelming majority is highly significant.

Once the vote was complete—with 71 in favor, 13 against and the rest of the 120 legislators abstaining—Knesset Speaker Amir Ohana said it was a "great honor to be ... proclaiming, with a clear voice and a solid majority: This is our land. This is our home. The Land of Israel belongs to the people of Israel."

He went on to invoke and set the record straight about the decades-old lie surrounding the aftermath of the Six-Day war.

"In 1967, the occupation did not begin; it ended, and our ancestral territories were returned to their rightful owners. We are the original indigenous people of this land. Jews cannot be considered 'occupiers' in a region that for 3,000 years has been called Judea," he said.

Yes, he stated, "These are truths that no false narrative can alter. This is the historical truth, the present-day truth, the parliamentary truth—and the only path to achieving real peace through strength, and to extinguish the false hopes in our enemies' hearts that we will disappear, be expelled or retreat from our homeland. We are here to stay."

MK Dan Illouz (Likud)—who, along with MKs Simcha Rothman (Religious Zionism), Limor Son Har-Melech (Otzma Yehudit) and Oded Forer (Yisrael Beiteinu)—submitted the resolution, explained the momentous nature of the move.

"For the first time ever, the Knesset is expressing official support for the application of Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria," he told JNS. "The message that came out of the plenary is clear: Judea and Samaria are not a bargaining chip [toward a "two-state solution"]; they are the heart of our country."

He stressed, "This is not a symbolic statement, but the beginning of a national decision. The world does not respect evasions, but a clear stand on our right to the Land of Israel."

The "national decision" has to be made by the government. Whether it will take the ball and run with it remains to be seen.

The question is whether the Cabinet and prime minister deem the timing appropriate. On one hand, there's the sense among many politicians in the nationalist camp that Israel should take the opportunity of such a pro-Israel administration in Washington to take the plunge.

On the other, the shaky U.S.-brokered negotiations in Qatar for the release of the remaining 50 hostages held by Hamas are ongoing, and U.S. President Donald Trump's vision for Mideast peace involves expanding the Abraham Accords. All well and good, but Saudi Arabia and other ostensible potential partners in the region haven't shed their disingenuous lip-service insistence on Palestinian statehood as a precondition for normalizing relations with Israel.

In the words of baseball legend Yogi Berra, "It's déjà vu all over again."

Rewind to the year 2020, during both Trump's and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's previous terms in office. In January of that year, Trump unveiled his "deal of the century" in the White House with a beaming Netanyahu by his side.

It was what Trump called the "most serious, realistic and detailed plan ever presented—one that could make Israelis, Palestinians and the

region safer and more prosperous."

He might have been right, but the Palestinians weren't buying any of it—certainly not the part about demilitarization or recognition of Israel as a Jewish state with sovereignty over large swaths of

Judea and Samaria, otherwise known and misnamed as the "West Bank."

Netanyahu clearly knew that this would be their reaction. So, he readily accepted the terms of the plan, and praised Trump to the skies.

"For too long, the heart of Israel has been outrageously branded as illegally occupied territory," he said. "Today, Mr. President, you are puncturing this big lie. You are recognizing Israel's sovereignty over all Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria—large and small alike."

It was after this that Netanyahu began to talk about annexing all Jewish settlements in the Jordan Valley and key areas of Judea and Samaria. At some point in the spring, he went as far as to announce July 1 the actual "target date" for applying Israeli law to the Jordan Valley and much of Judea and Samaria.

It wasn't to be, however. Netanyahu put it all on hold, if not deep in storage, due to the Abraham Accords, signed on Sept. 15. This wasn't only as a concession to Trump, whose support for Israel had been so strong.

It was also because of his own longstanding belief that peace in the Middle East doesn't require the establishment of a Palestinian state. And the normalization agreements with the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain and subsequently Morocco perfectly illustrated that notion.

Then came the Biden administration, which promptly tried to undermine that very idea. Months later, the Netanyahu-led government was replaced in June 2021 by the Naftali Bennett-Yair Lapid rotation coalition. As a result, the ridiculous mindset about the centrality of the Palestinians to Mideast "peace" returned in full, pathetic force.

A year and half later, Netanyahu was back at the helm in Jerusalem, with a hostile Joe Biden his counterpart in the Oval Office. The animosity was palpable. We're now learning just how instrumental his administration was in fomenting—and funding—the anti-Netanyahu protest movement.

The Oct. 7, 2023 massacre shifted everyone's attention to Hamas atrocities and the war in Gaza. Suddenly, after having turned a cold shoulder to the Israeli leader for the 10 months after he formed his right-wing government, Biden made a visit to the Jewish state. At that point, any of the already dwindling discussions of "peacemaking" with the Palestinians evaporated, even on the left.

These were supplanted by an inversion of perpetrator and victim, with Israel being touted by terror-apologists abroad as the former—and Netanyahu blamed at home by his haters for the security failure on Oct. 7, as well as everything that followed.

Criticism from the right has taken a totally different form, of course. Accusations have pertained not to pity for the Gazans, but to an excess of caution in the effort to achieve "total victory." These have included warnings about the threat of a sequel to Oct. 7 emerging from the Palestinian-controlled areas in Judea and Samaria.

But the constant terrorism emanating from that front isn't the main impetus behind the push for annexation. No, the real reason is that Judea and Samaria constitute the biblical heartland of the Jewish people.

Israel's hesitance to assert this fact stems from misguided fantasies of eventual peaceful coexistence and fear of international wrath. That the former has only led to the spilling of Jewish blood and the latter is a constant, no matter what Israel does, was obvious all along to the sector of the public labeled "messianic" and "extremist."

Oct. 7 caused a host of others to wake up to the reality that ceding rights to the land of Israel arouses more, not less, antisemitism.

The Sovereignty Movement, founded in 2011, explains: "As long

as there is no Israeli sovereignty, the nations of the world will continue to view us as 'colonialist occupiers.' The issue of Judea and Samaria will always come up for discussion, framed by the false narrative Israel introduced through the disastrous Oslo Accords in 1993: 'land for peace.' The application of sovereignty through a government or Knesset decision will put an end to the Arab hope for a Palestinian state west of the Jordan and to the terrorism they use to achieve it. ... It is not Arab despair that fuels terrorism, but rather their hope that they still have a chance to take our land. This hope for the establishment of a state in the heart of our homeland must be eradicated once and for all."

The Knesset's declaration to that effect is a necessary first step in this necessary and moral endeavor. No wonder the bulk of the local press is treating it like an item not worthy of coverage. (JNS Jul 24)

Moral Inversion: When the Free World Abandons Freedom

By Avi Abelow

Sometimes, history slaps you in the face with clarity. That moment is now.

This past week, 25 Western democracies—self-proclaimed beacons of morality and human rights—issued a joint statement condemning Israel. They did not condemn Hamas, the genocidal terror regime responsible for murder and other atrocities on Oct. 7, 2023, but Israel, the country doing everything in its power to stop it and rescue innocent hostages who have been held by Palestinians in Gaza since then.

The statement accuses Israel of depriving Gazans of "human dignity," while saying nothing, not one word, about Hamas's use of women and children as human shields, hospitals as weapons depots, or United Nations schools as launchpads for rockets.

It ignores the widespread support among Gaza's population for the Oct. 7 massacre, the mass murder, rape and mutilation of Jews, and the celebration as our hostages, dead or alive, were paraded in the streets of Gaza to captivity.

This joint statement is morally bankrupt. It is an act of cowardice. Worse, it represents complicity. What these 25 governments have done is hand Hamas a global diplomatic lifeline. Their message is crystal clear: "Don't surrender. Don't release the hostages. We'll keep the pressure on Israel for you."

That's exactly why the government of Israel keeps caving to Hamas's outrageous negotiation demands, putting Israeli lives at risk, while Hamas keeps rejecting every ceasefire deal. And why shouldn't it? The Western world, including the United States, is doing its bidding, pressuring Israel on its behalf.

This is evil cloaked in virtue-signaling, with the West pitying the perpetrators, not their victims.

As Mike Huckabee, the U.S. ambassador to Israel, rightly put it: "Disgusting! 25 nations put pressure on Israel instead of the savages of Hamas! Gaza suffers for one reason: Hamas rejects EVERY proposal. Blaming Israel is irrational."

Hamas weaponizes civilians, builds tunnels under homes, hospitals and churches and hides its leadership behind children and grandmothers. Yet somehow, the one condemned is Israel, which has the only military in history to send warnings before striking as well as aid to the enemy population trying to destroy it.

Where is the outrage at Hamas for rejecting every ceasefire deal? For prolonging the war? For refusing to release hostages, even when Israel agreed—time and time again—to painful concessions?

And where is the demand from these 25 nations that the Red Cross visit the hostages? It's been nearly two years since they were taken, raped, mutilated, tortured, and yet, the international community remains silent. Silent.

That silence screams. But in this darkness, there is also clarity.

This is no longer just Israel vs. Iran/Qatar/Egypt/Hamas. This is good vs. evil. It's not hyperbole; it's reality.

Israel is the only country in the Middle East where minorities thrive, where Christian communities grow, where Muslims enjoy full civil rights, and where women lead in government, business, and science. We are the nation that treated wounded Syrians during their civil war, quietly, without cameras. We're the country that leads the world in disaster relief, even to our enemies.

Who is helping the Druze in Syria as they face jihadist massacres? Not France. Not the Vatican. Not even Washington. Only Israel.

Yet the moral outrage of the West is reserved for us.

While Sunni and Shi'ite extremists wage war, destroy cultures, execute gays and enslave women, the West looks away. Worse, it enables them.

These 25 countries haven't just failed to stand with Israel. They have betrayed their own values. They've discarded the very Judeo-Christian moral foundations that gave birth to their democracies in the first place.

From the river to the sea, there will be one Jewish State of Israel—sovereign, secure and unapologetically strong. We have zero tolerance for terror. And zero patience for those who enable it.

To the morally confused governments of the West: You've made yourselves irrelevant. You have proven that you don't understand who your enemies are. And we will no longer seek your approval.

Israel will stand—not only for our people but for the entire free world, a world that seems to have forgotten what freedom even means. Because in a time of mass confusion, blood libels and Western appeasement of genocidal terror, the light of Israel shines even brighter. (JNS Jul 22)

Syria's New Dawn is Already a Nightmare By Andrew Fox

Fighting has engulfed the Druze-majority city of Sweida in southern Syria, leaving over 200 people dead. This week, Druze villages have been overrun by Syrian regime forces and allied Islamist militias under the guise of 'restoring order', only for those forces to unleash executions, looting and arson upon Druze neighbourhoods. According to the Syrian Observatory for Human Rights, 92 Druze were killed (including 21 civilians executed by government troops) in the space of a few days. In one incident, an 80-year-old Druze sheikh had his moustache, a symbol of honour, forcibly shaved by invading fighters. He was reportedly killed shortly afterwards. This is, it appears, the dark reality of 'national unity' under Syria's new rulers.

The Druze of Sweida are not the only minorities being targeted. In March, on Syria's Mediterranean coast, over a thousand Alawite civilians were slaughtered in sectarian pogroms. Jihadist militants of Hayat Tahrir al-Sham (HTS) and the Turkish-backed Syrian National Army rampaged through Alawite villages, committing mass murder and revenge killings. A Reuters investigation found that nearly 1,500 Alawite men, women and children were killed between 7 and 9 March by Sunni fighters in Alawite areas.

The violence was ostensibly triggered by a short-lived rebellion of loyalists to former Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, but the response descended into outright collective punishment. There have been killings, looting and arson targeting Alawites at 40 separate sites at least. Nor were the perpetrators rogue outlaws – they included at least a dozen factions now under the command of Syria's new government. Many of these are notorious Islamist militias, who have long been under international sanctions for prior atrocities. Graffiti scrawled on a ransacked Alawite home declared: 'You were a minority and now you are a rarity.' The intent was nothing less than ethnic cleansing.

The Syrian regime in Damascus, led by interim president Ahmed al-Sharaa (better known as Abu Muhammad al-Jolani), a former ISIS and al-Qaeda member, denies any policy of targeting Alawites. But it is impossible to ignore the regime's fingerprints on these crimes. Reuters has traced a chain of command from the Alawite massacres in March straight to men serving alongside Sharaa. Orders from Damascus to crush the 'remnants' of Assad's old regime were interpreted on the ground as a licence to exterminate Alawites. Sharaa's government claims to be investigating these crimes, vowing punishment 'even among those closest to us', but impunity reigns. No one has been held to account for March's bloodbath, and now a similar atrocity is unfolding against the Druze.

The optimism that met Syria's new Islamist-led regime last year now appears deeply misguided. When HTS and other insurgents ousted Bashar al-Assad's dictatorship, Sharaa's ascent to power in December was greeted by many Western leaders and media figures as

a fresh start. The jihadist warlord was feted by the commentariat, even cosied up to by the likes of Alastair Campbell and Rory Stewart on their *The Rest Is Politics* podcast. But for Syria's minorities, the regime change has meant a change in the costumes of the rulers rather than a change in their character. Sharaa insists he seeks to 'unite' Syria. In practice, his rule has been marked by sectarian score-settling and broken promises.

The most recent bloodshed followed a familiar pattern. In Sweida, militias struck a deal with Sharaa's forces to enter the city peacefully. As soon as troops moved in, they indulged in savage practices: summarily executing civilians, looting homes and humiliating elders. Sharaa's office issued a statement decrying unspecified 'unfortunate violations' in Sweida and promising to hold those responsible to account. This is almost a replay of the regime's response after the Alawite massacres in March, when Sharaa similarly condemned 'shameful acts' and vowed justice. Back then, as now, officials claimed the bloodletting was carried out by unruly militias beyond the government's direct command.

This excuse is wearing thin. If these Islamist militias are truly outside Sharaa's control, then he is either unable or unwilling to rein in his own allies. Both possible scenarios bode ill for Syria. If the president is too weak to stop genocidal violence by forces fighting under his banner, then Syria remains a patchwork of warlords with no real peace. If instead he quietly endorses or tolerates these pogroms, then his government is complicit in crimes against humanity, merely continuing Assad's legacy of brutality under a different flag. Sharaa's 'inclusive' government has proven to be cold comfort for those not aligned with his jihadist base.

Amid this bloodshed, Israel has initiated a military intervention to defend Syria's Druze community. Beginning on Wednesday, the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) targeted Syrian troops in Sweida, and struck the Syrian military headquarters in the centre of Damascus. Jerusalem took a firm stance: leave the Druze alone, or face the consequences. Unlike the hollow threats we hear so often from Western countries, Israel's warning was supported by force. Israeli strikes destroyed Syrian tanks and vehicles near Sweida and targeted over 160 sites in Syria this week. The IDF has also moved two divisions to the Israel-Syria border in case a broader confrontation ensues.

Israel's intervention is not purely altruistic. From Israel's perspective, the Syrian regime's deployment of armed forces into southern Syria posed a direct threat to its border. Furthermore, the Druze community within Israel, an Arabic-speaking minority that serves conspicuously in the IDF, has close kinship ties to the Syrian Druze. The outrage within Israel over the Sweida massacres quickly turned into protests blocking highways. Hundreds of Israeli Druze even crossed into Syria to defend their brethren. Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu, facing internal controversies, seized an opportunity to appear tough and decisive. Launching airstrikes in support of the Sweida Druze has proven popular domestically, earning him political points while signalling strength.

Israel's actions also reflect a broader strategic purpose. Its strikes near Damascus were initially seen as a 'performative escalation' – warning shots rather than conclusive strikes. The aim is deterrence: to signal to President Sharaa that any attempt to unify Syria by force, especially by moving armed units into the south, will be met with Israeli firepower.

Some observers argue that Israel simply prefers a weak and divided Syria. By attacking Sharaa's forces, Israel limits the new regime's ability to establish control. However, regardless of Israel's motivation – a mix of realpolitik and solidarity with the Druze – the fact remains that Israeli airstrikes probably saved many Druze lives this week by stopping the advance of sectarian killers.

Israel at least seems to understand what kind of regime it is dealing with in Syria. The contrast with the UK here could hardly be more stark. Barely two weeks before the Sweida massacre, UK foreign secretary David Lammy was in Damascus, shaking hands with President Sharaa and pledging £94.5million in aid to support Syria's 'long-term recovery'. With great fanfare, the UK re-established diplomatic ties with Syria after 14 years. Lammy spoke of 'renewed hope' and an 'inclusive and representative' transition.

Washington has been equally eager to embrace Syria's post-Assad regime. US president Donald Trump lifted sanctions on Syria in June,

and even praised Sharaa as an 'attractive, tough guy'. He also floated the idea of Syria joining an expanded Abraham Accords peace framework, therefore recognising Israel. The logic was simple: bring Syria in from the cold, peel it away from Iran's orbit, and declare the 14-year civil war resolved.

That aspiration is now in tatters. The massacres of Druze and Alawites cast grave doubt on the new Syrian government's credibility and intentions. For all the talk of a fresh start, Syria's interim rulers have shown a grim continuity with the past: intolerance of dissent, reliance on sectarian militias and a propensity for violence. The West's willingness to overlook HTS's jihadist pedigree in exchange for a quick diplomatic win now looks not just cynical, but also dangerously naïve.

Sharaa's cabinet is literally teeming with individuals and factions under terrorism and human-rights sanctions. Did London and Washington really believe such actors would morph overnight into guarantors of pluralism and human rights? With scattered revenge killings of regime loyalists, crackdowns on minority communities, early signs of trouble were already there, but many Western policymakers and media outlets downplayed them. The result is that Western nations are now awkwardly complicit. British aid and American rapprochement have effectively helped legitimise a government whose associates have now butchered over a thousand men, women and children based on their sect. How will these same leaders credibly condemn atrocities elsewhere when they stayed mum on Syria's? It is a staggering moral failure.

These events have sobering implications. Regionally, Syria's 'new dawn' is revealing itself as just another nightmare. And far from unifying the country, Sharaa's reliance on hard-line Islamist forces is deepening its fractures. The Druze, long wary of both Assad and Sunni extremism, may now conclude that they have no place in the new Syria, potentially sparking an exodus or armed self-defence. The Alawites, who already feel betrayed and endangered, could turn to desperate measures, perhaps even inviting foreign protection or forming insurgencies. Sectarian bloodshed on this scale risks reigniting a cycle of vengeance that could unravel the fragile peace achieved. In Lebanon next door, where Druze and Alawite communities also exist, the spillover of sectarian tensions is an ominous possibility. Israel's direct strikes on Damascus also mark a dangerous escalation, and serve as a reminder that Syria's war can at any moment ignite regional conflagration.

As the Druze and Alawite tragedies have shown, there is nothing 'inclusive' or 'reformed' about Sharaa's new regime. (Spiked Jul 18)

After the War: Israel's Economic Future Looks Strong, Stable – and Full of Potential Dr. Amit Serusi

Over the past year and a half, and especially in recent weeks, headlines in Israel have focused almost exclusively on missiles, reserve duty and growing security concerns. But beneath the surface, a different process is quietly unfolding. Amid this turbulent time, clear signals are emerging that Israel's economy is not just enduring — it's stabilizing, strengthening, and preparing for a significant leap forward.

Since the outbreak of conflict with Iran, the Israeli market has displayed remarkable resilience. The TA-35 index has climbed, the shekel has appreciated against the dollar, and this is happening in contrast to negative trends in other global markets. This isn't coincidence — it's a direct reflection of trust. Both Israeli and foreign investors are recognizing an opportunity: a dynamic market, advanced technology, and the very real possibility of regional stability that could position Israel as a central economic force in the Middle East.

To be sure, there are challenges: a growing fiscal deficit, a temporarily slowed high-tech sector, and small businesses that continue to struggle. But now, with the Iranian threat diminishing and security pressure easing from Gaza, Lebanon and other Iranian-backed arenas, Israel is approaching a potential turning point.

Why now?

Because the reduction of strategic threats creates a fundamentally different environment — one of growing stability and renewed confidence. That's exactly the kind of setting in which economies

thrive. As the security situation continues to improve, more global companies will look to Israel as a strategic destination. More capital will flow in. Investments that were on pause will resume. And Israel will not only be seen as a hub of innovation — but also as a stable regional partner.

Most importantly, this isn't just recovery — it's acceleration.

Possible normalization with additional Arab states could unlock a new era of unprecedented economic cooperation, regional mega-projects, and shared infrastructure. It's a scenario in which Israel not only exports technology, but also helps generate regional stability and long-term prosperity.

Now is the time — for entrepreneurs, executives, investors and citizens — to believe in growth, participate actively, and take part in shaping the next chapter of Israel's economic future.

Because Israel's destiny is no longer defined solely by defense. It will be shaped by the economic vision we choose to lead with. And right now — Israel is ready to lead it. (Ynet Jul 10)

When All Is Genocide By Thane Rosenbaum

Happy days for Jew-haters came last week with a gargantuan op-ed in the New York Times—3,620 words in length—denouncing Israel's war in Gaza with the damning title: "I'm a Genocide Scholar. I Know It When I See It."

The essay appeared in the paper of record that has an abysmal record of objectivity when it comes to Israel. Honestly, it was more befitting of an even more anti-Israel outfit, such as the BBC.

(For perspective, I have four bylines to my name at the Times' op-ed section, the longest being 1,061 words. Rarely does the paper publish one over 1,000. This was more *magnus opus* than opinion.)

Apparently, charging Israel with genocide deserves such fanfare. It didn't hurt that he is Israeli, too. The Times selected a Jewish "scholar" who teaches Holocaust and genocide studies at Brown University. They apparently believed that his expertise, ethnicity and affiliation made him the final word on the subject.

I have some news that is truly fit to print: The op-ed is utter nonsense.

We have sadly come to learn that, especially in the Ivy League, "Studies" as a suffix to one's major—Gender, Women's, African-American, Climate, Queer, Indigenous—requires very little "studying" to graduate.

Good grades in college can come from social activism over book learning. Raucous protesting, showing contempt for the United States, demonizing the black sheep of whiteness, and calling for the destruction of Israel and the murder of Jews are becoming the *summa cum laude* of higher learning.

The Ivy League is now conferring PhDs in reputational ruin and brand annihilation.

I recently published "Beyond Proportionality: Israel's Just War in Gaza," a book that clarifies international humanitarian law, the laws of armed conflict and military doctrine in the context of this war. The Times op-ed has little use for those details, however. More than 3,000 words were devoted instead to distorted facts and imaginary thinking.

The crux seems to be that the Gazan war dead, combined with the destruction of its infrastructure, amounts to genocide—even though the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, ratified in 1948, never contemplated that meaning.

Mass casualties and fallen buildings in wartime do not a genocide make. It doesn't even prove the existence of war crimes. Death tolls and devastated landscapes are endemic to war.

Imagine if in 1945, the New York Times charged the United States with genocide based entirely on the bombings over Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Dresden. Worse still, what if the paper never mentioned Pearl Harbor or the German atrocities that would come to be known as the Holocaust?

Imagine if in 1945, the New York Times charged the United States with genocide based entirely on the bombings over Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Dresden. Worse still, what if the paper never mentioned Pearl Harbor or the German atrocities that would come to be known as the Holocaust?

Well, that's precisely what this op-ed fails to report. What took place on October 7, 2023 goes largely unmentioned. It completely

ignores the scale of the barbarism and claims Israel's equating of Hamas with the Nazis is "propaganda."

The silent treatment is also given to the hostages in Gaza, the fact that Hamas and Islamic Jihad still have not surrendered (unlike the Nazis and kamikazes in World War II) and have all throughout promised repeat performances of October 7— "again and again."

Talk about burying the lede!

It downplays the war itself, calling its continuation a "misnomer"—even though Hamas is still firing rockets, and killing IDF soldiers and Gazans seeking humanitarian aid. Most importantly, Hamas is recruiting terrorists to shore up its ranks.

Genocide requires a finding of specific "intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group." Genocides are never to be confused or conflated with war.

When a nation is at war, the objective is the killing of militants, and the destruction of weapons warehouses, launching pads, and command centers. Civilians, inevitably but unintentionally, are killed in the process. But the laws of war are not violated so long as the targets had a military necessity. Dead civilians are "collateral" to the war aim—which is why they are referred to as "collateral damage."

International tribunals never judged Serbia's 1992-95 mass killings in Bosnia and Herzegovina to be genocide because, except for the massacre at Srebrenica, all the other deaths resulted from war.

The Times' op-ed tries to circumvent this definitional problem by citing that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu vowed that the Palestinian people would pay a "huge price" and Gaza would be turned to "rubble." IDF officials called the participants of October 7 "human animals" deserving of "total annihilation."

So what? After gangraping Israeli teenagers, torching Jewish infants, and murdering 1,200, what did one expect the prime minister, and wartime generals, of the nation so savagely attacked to say? And what other outcome could Gazans have expected—the delivery of bundt cakes in gratitude for the most heinous slaughter of Jews since the Holocaust?

The Final Solution to the Jewish Question was entirely separate from World War II. So, too, was Turkey's elimination of its Armenian population during World War I. The Cambodian, Rwandan, Congolese and Sudanese genocides were also unrelated to wars, as are today's killings of Tigrayans in Ethiopia and the Uyghurs in China—two genocides that the world simply won't address because they are unrelated to its favorite pastime: antisemitism.

There can be no genocide if civilians are not targeted for death. The only reason Gazan civilians are dead is because Hamas insists on deploying friends and family as human shields. Yet, in the deranged mind of this genocide "scholar," even Israel's evacuation warnings count against it. Apparently, displacing civilians from one safe zone to another "morph(s) into genocide."

What?!

This is the moral narcissism of yet another Jew leveraging personal integrity for career advancement. Here he is concocting an imaginary crime—a new form of genocide where it doesn't matter how or whether anyone gets killed. Destroying homes is now genocidal, too, because it makes "the revival of Palestinian life in the territory highly unlikely."

Why is that? Gaza can be rebuilt, as were Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Dresden—all in the aftermath of a war where the losing side surrendered, which Hamas has thus far failed to do, and where the enemy was thoroughly vanquished, which also remains unfinished.

The Times op-ed laments that Holocaust scholars, and institutions dedicated to its commemoration, won't adopt his warped redefinition of the crime. Of course they won't! Their mission is to prevent the trivialization of the Holocaust. Crediting all human death and physical destruction as genocidal is the antithesis of Holocaust memory.

Is COVID now genocide, too?

Even more importantly, all true genocides have one thing in common—a massive subtraction of the population. But the Palestinian people have more than tripled since the "Occupation."

Not only is the op-ed an absurdity and the crime it envisions a fabrication, but it is an insult to millions who were actual victims of a genocide. Quite an achievement for a "genocide scholar."

(Jewish Journal Jul 20)