



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*

Settlement of the
Question of Palestine
and the Implementation of the
Two-State Solution." At the
event, Barrot argued that the
decision to recognize
"Palestine" was a logical
outgrowth of France's

Commentary...

The Twisted Logic Behind Recognition of Palestinian Statehood

By Robert Satloff

In an unusual confluence of events, recent days have witnessed a flurry of diplomatic activity on the Israel-Palestinian conflict unseen in many years. This included an outcry of anguish and protest both at home and abroad at Israel's handling of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, the convening in New York of an international conference under Saudi and French chairmanship designed to resuscitate the moribund "two-state solution," and the announcement by three close American allies—France, Britain, and Canada—of their intention to extend full diplomatic recognition to the "state of Palestine" at the annual meeting of the United Nations General Assembly next month. These were recently joined by Australia, and New Zealand is reportedly considering a similar move.

Any real connection among these events is hard to decipher. A two-state solution may offer a theoretical, long-term answer to the core dispute between Israelis and Palestinians, but rallying to its defense today will do nothing to address the food-delivery challenge in Gaza, let alone bring that gruesome war to an end. And recognition of Palestinian statehood may address some domestic political needs in Europe and Canada but it will do nothing to assuage the concerns of the constituency that matters most—Israel's voting public—which fears the dangers to its safety that might accompany Palestinian statehood, rejects the idea by a large majority, and has elected successive governments that reflect that view.

With Hamas responding to the upsurge in global condemnation of Israel by feeling confident enough to release images of an emaciated hostage compelled to dig his own grave, it is fair to say that both the end of the Gaza War and the achievement of a two-state solution are further from realization today than before these recent events. To the extent these diplomatic initiatives had any impact, the worsening on both the humanitarian and peacemaking fronts is largely because of—not despite—this flurry of largely performative activity.

Nonetheless, understanding the logic, rationale, and motivations of key actors at this moment of intense diplomatic activity is revealing. The announcement by Paris, London, and Ottawa of their intention to recognize Palestine is a useful case in point. While these declarations produced similar headlines, leaders of the three countries offered very different rationales for their policy shifts and couched their decisions in very different terms. The lack of coherence in their approaches underscored the disconnect between identifying a policy objective and defining a strategy to achieve it—a condition with which close observers of Israel's response to the horror of October 7 are regrettably familiar. It's worth taking a careful look at the respective arguments put forward by these countries—and their respective flaws.

France

President Emmanuel Macron took center stage with his July 24 announcement that France will recognize Palestine at the meeting of the UN General Assembly in September, describing the move as a way to advance a negotiated resolution of the Israel-Palestinian conflict. "Given its historic commitment to a just and sustainable peace in the Middle East, I have decided that France will recognize the state of Palestine," Macron declared on social media. "Peace is possible."

Beyond Macron's brief online remarks, the most comprehensive rationale for this policy shift was presented by his foreign minister, Jean-Noël Barrot, at the New York diplomatic conclave formally called the "High-Level International Conference on the Peaceful

longstanding advocacy for the idea of "two peoples having two states." Moreover, he described this position as a riposte both to Hamas, which would be "categorically reject[ed] and permanently isolate[ed]," and to the "irresponsible aims of extremists who, in Israel, refuse the right to exist of Palestinians and who shamefully and blindly spread violence and hatred."

Historical accuracy was apparently not Barrot's top concern. To give his argument some patriotic heft, he cited a litany of French leaders whose positions would lend a sense of continuity to the recognition announcement. But surely Barrot was informed that when Charles de Gaulle said in 1967 that the resolution of the conflict must be based on "the recognition by each of the states involved of all the others," he was referring to Jordan as the principal Arab partner, not the Palestinians. And surely Barrot was told that when Francois Mitterand called for mutual Israel-Palestinian recognition in his 1982 Knesset speech, Mitterand then said a few sentences later, "No one can decide the borders and the conditions, which, according to UN Resolution 242, are dependent on both sides. The negotiators must decide on this issue." (Emphasis added.) And it is no surprise that Barrot did not cite the statement of his own predecessor, Foreign Minister Stéphane Séjourné, who responded caustically to the announcement of Spain's recognition of Palestinian statehood in May 2024 by saying, "Tell me, what exactly has the Spanish recognition changed a day later in Gaza? Nothing!"

Barrot's most eyebrow-raising assertion was that France could recognize Palestine because Benjamin Netanyahu's own conditions for Palestinian statehood, as outlined in his 2009 Bar-Ilan University speech, had been fulfilled. As Barrot stated "In the letter to the president of the French republic and the Saudi crown prince, the president of the Palestinian Authority condemned for the first time the October 7 terrorist attacks, called for the immediate release of the hostages of Hamas, and called for the latter's disarmament and its exclusion from Gaza's governance. He confirmed the end of allowances for the families of prisoners convicted of terrorism offences, announced a reform of school textbooks to remove all hate speech, and committed to holding presidential and general elections in 2026. The conditions set down for the acceptance of a Palestinian state by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, in his 2009 Bar-Ilan speech, are met."

Evidently, Barrot must have assumed that no one hearing his remarks would actually check the text of Netanyahu's Bar-Ilan speech, a review of which quite clearly shows that Abbas's commitments do not address, let alone fulfill, the two conditions Netanyahu laid out. While it is true that disarmament, to which Abbas said he was committed, was one of those conditions, Netanyahu described his most important condition this way: "The fundamental condition for ending the conflict is the public, binding, and sincere Palestinian recognition of Israel as the national homeland of the Jewish people"—not recognition of Israel's right to exist but specifically its legitimacy as the Jewish state. Neither Abbas nor the Palestine Liberation Organization has ever issued such a declaration, and whether or not one believes it is an appropriate demand, one cannot legitimately assert that recognition of Palestinian statehood is merited because Netanyahu's Bar-Ilan conditions have been met.

Britain

Five days after Macron's announcement, the British prime minister Keir Starmer made his own headlines by also declaring his government's intention to recognize Palestine at the upcoming meeting of the General Assembly, saying it was largely in response to the "intolerable" situation in Gaza. But just as with Macron, it was

Starmer's foreign minister, David Lammy, who provided the most detailed explication of British policy at the "two-state solution" conference in New York. And just as with his French counterpart, Lammy resorted to historical legerdemain to substantiate a policy that numerous British governments had previously rejected.

Unlike Barrot, Lammy did not ground his argument in a too-clever-by-half assertion that Netanyahu's own conditions for Palestinian statehood had been met. Instead, he grounded it in an equally bold but problematic assertion: that recognition is the logical response to Britain finally coming to grips with the realization that a key stipulation in the original Balfour Declaration—the 1917 statement by the government of Prime Minister David Lloyd George that first committed a great power to support the Zionist project in Palestine—was not being fulfilled. Specifically, Lammy noted that the statement conditioned Britain's commitment to a "national home for the Jewish people" in Palestine on the promise "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights" of the Palestinian people." He then added: "This has not been upheld and it is a historical injustice which continues to unfold," turning immediately then to the need to support the two-state solution.

It is difficult to imagine a more stunningly revisionist reading of the Balfour Declaration.

First, the original words of the declaration refer not to the Palestinian people but to "existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." That wording, along with the terms "civil and religious rights," were used because Britain had no intention of endowing Palestine's "non-Jewish communities" with political rights (such as to statehood); those were being held in custodianship for Britain's wartime Arab allies, especially the Hashemite dynasty that then ruled Mecca and that still rules Jordan today.

Second, to the extent that Britain remains committed today to the terms of this 108-year-old resolution, it would be logical for its continued interest in "religious and civil rights" to apply to non-Jewish communities in territory under Israel's sovereign control (i.e., Israel's Arab population), not to the Palestinian residents of territory under a military occupation whose legality Britain has repeatedly endorsed. And while Israel's record is not unblemished in terms of the civil rights of its Arab population, that population fares far better than citizens in most Middle Eastern countries and their situation cannot, by any stretch, be characterized as a "historical injustice."

And third, if Britain is suddenly going to cite insufficient fulfillment of the terms of the Balfour Declaration as rationale for recognizing Palestinian statehood, it stands to reason that it should also take long-overdue action on the other subordinate clause in the original resolution whose terms have been repeatedly and consistently violated, especially by many of those countries who participated in the New York meeting on a two-state solution. This is the phrase that commits Britain to the idea "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice . . . the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." This phrase is especially problematic for the Starmer government because it underscores the fact that, apart from the Jews of Palestine, the only group whose political rights were a concern of the drafters of the Balfour Declaration were other Jews, i.e., "Jews in any other country." Indeed, to maintain any claim to consistency, one should expect a British initiative to press for reparations from all those Arab and Muslim states where Jews suffered political or economic harm—communally and individually—in the years following the founding of Israel.

If Lammy's reading of the Balfour Declaration was historically suspect, so too was his recitation of past UN action on Palestinian statehood. This is what he had to say on the issue "As diplomats and politicians, we have become accustomed to uttering the words "a two-state solution." Countless times this Assembly and the Security Council have proclaimed that there must be a two-state resolution. Resolution after resolution. Resolution 181. Resolution 242. Resolution 446. Resolution 1515. Resolution 2334. These are not numbers on a page, but the conviction of a frustrated world."

This is an impressive sounding list but it doesn't stand up under

scrutiny.

- UNGA 181 (1947) is the original UNSCOP Partition Resolution. Its recommendations were famously accepted by the Zionist leadership and rejected by all Arab states and the Palestinian leadership.
- UNSCR 242 (1967), the founding document of modern Arab-Israeli peacemaking, makes no reference either to a "two-state solution" or even to the Palestinians. It calls for the establishment of a "just and lasting peace" that will include Israel's withdrawal to "secure and recognized borders" and a "just settlement of the refugee problem." At the time, Jordan and Egypt were viewed as the parties that would regain territory from which Israel would withdraw and the resolution, which was drafted by Britain's Lord Caradon, did not envision the creation of a separate Palestinian state.
- UNSCR 446 (1979) condemns Israeli settlement activity in Gaza and the West Bank but makes no reference to a "two-state solution." It is especially odd for Lammy to cite this resolution since it was not supported by the British government, which abstained on the vote.

Perhaps the strangest aspect of Lammy's presentation was that, unlike the French, he conditioned Britain's promised September recognition of Palestine, a policy he implied was decades in the making, on the steps Israel and Hamas each take over the next several weeks:

"We will do it [recognize Palestinian statehood] unless the Israeli government acts to end the appalling situation in Gaza, ends its military campaign, and commits to a long-term sustainable peace based on a two-state solution.

"Our demands on Hamas also remain absolute and unwavering. Before the UN General Assembly gathers, we will take stock of how far the parties have come in meeting these steps."

In other words, Britain's promise to recognize Palestine is not really a principled measure that derives from realization that terms of a century-old promise have not been fulfilled. Rather, it represents a threat wielded not only to coerce Israel to alter its Gaza strategy but also to adopt a political platform—support for a "two-state solution"—that, according to polls, is opposed by up to four-fifths of Israeli public opinion. While Lammy did say that "No one side will have a veto on recognition through their actions or inactions," his words suggest otherwise; that is to say, whether or not Hamas accedes to demands to release Israeli hostages, cease fighting, and hand power to some other administrative/political authority, Israel is expected to fulfill all Britain's requirements or face the diplomatic consequences. Clearly the conditionality was more theater than practical policy, perhaps just a way to differentiate the Whitehall approach from that of the Quai d'Orsay.

Canada

If Britain and France based their arguments for recognizing Palestine on a heavily massaged reading of their respective diplomatic histories, Canada adopted a very different approach.

When the Canadian foreign minister Anita Anand spoke at the two-state-solution conference on July 28, recognizing statehood was not even on her agenda. Her big headline was to announce the commitment of an additional \$30 million in humanitarian support for Palestinians in Gaza. Along the way, she reaffirmed the traditional approach to Israel-Palestinian peacemaking by noting that "a lasting political solution requires a permanent cease-fire to begin the hard work of rebuilding institutions, restoring trust and the conditions for a viable two-state solution. . . . No durable solution can emerge without all parties at the table. Until that time, and after a cease-fire, the government of Canada will be present with humanitarian aid and will play a leading role in building bridges to more and more aid for Gaza with international partners." Statehood did not feature prominently in her remarks at all.

Two days later, however, Canada made a complete volte-face with an announcement by Prime Minister Mark Carney that ran in the exact opposite direction from the one delivered by his foreign

minister. Specifically, Carney said:

Canada has long been committed to a two-state solution—an independent, viable, and sovereign Palestinian state living side by side with the state of Israel in peace and security. For decades, it was hoped that this outcome would be achieved as part of a peace process built around a negotiated settlement between the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority. Regrettably, this approach is no longer tenable.

In just 48 hours, Ottawa reversed 58 years of foreign policy, Canada having contributed significantly to the drafting of UNSCR 242 as a member of the Security Council in 1967. And Carney did it by specifically lamenting the death of the very idea of a negotiated settlement of the Israel-Palestinian conflict, a goal that Britain and France said their recognition statements were meant to protect. Perhaps recognizing the logical limitations of his argument, Carney did not suggest how a Palestinian state would come into being absent agreement with Israel, but neither did he suggest that recognition would advance the idea of a negotiated settlement. In other words, Carney offered policy as aspiration, without any plan for execution.

That's not the only unique aspect of Carney's statehood announcement. As is the case with Britain, Canada's promise to recognize Palestine was conditional, but whereas Lammy conditioned Britain's September recognition on Israel's actions during the coming six weeks, Carney quite remarkably conditioned his commitment to recognize a Palestinian state next month on a promise that Mahmoud Abbas said he would fulfill next year—a promise to hold Hamas-free general elections. In other words, Carney offered to provide Abbas a huge political victory based solely on the latter's commitment to hold elections—a promise he has made, and failed to fulfill, multiple times during his twenty-year presidency.

Would Canada withdraw its recognition if, once again, Palestinian elections were postponed? Smart enough to limit his embarrassment, Carney didn't say. Carney did add that Hamas must immediately release all hostages, disarm, and play no role in the future governance of Palestine but, importantly, he didn't condition Canada's recognition of Palestinian statehood on any of those demands being fulfilled.

From Recognition to Statehood?

While the conditionality aspect of Canada's declaration seems nonsensical, Carney deserves credit for injecting a certain realism into his declaration. After all, he did not suggest in his remarks that the purely symbolic step of recognition would actually advance the goal of creating a Palestinian state—claims that Lammy and Barrot, each in his own way, both made. It is difficult however, to see the mechanism by which even near-global recognition of Palestinian statehood translates that concept into fact.

Of course, logic may not have been the main motivation for these diplomatic moves. Just a month before Macron's announcement, the French Interior Ministry recommended that France recognize a Palestinian state as a way to "appease" its large Muslim population. Similarly, as the former British ambassador to Israel Simon McDonald—a supporter of Starmer's statehood recognition—wrote in the Guardian, "There is no Palestinian state and there certainly won't be one by September. For mostly domestic political reasons, they have decided to set aside that fact. Recognition is an understandable gesture, but it will do nothing to solve the current famine and is doomed in the short term because there is no real state to recognise." Indeed, governments that have long railed against U.S. Middle East policy for being so driven by domestic politics have just taken a step for largely domestic reasons that may in fact ensure that Palestinian statehood is doomed in the long run, too.

The unalterable reality that has governed diplomacy since 1967 is that Israel, which controls the West Bank and has reasserted control over Gaza as a result of its post-October 7 military operation, needs to be convinced that its security will be enhanced, not threatened, by territorial withdrawal and the creation of a sovereign, if demilitarized, Palestinian state. This requires winning over a huge swath of Israel's increasingly skeptical public opinion, one much larger today than it was on October 6, 2023—a fact that countries who choose the easy symbolism of recognizing a Palestinian state seem to ignore. To be

sure, settler-advocate parties play a major role in the current Israeli government, as reflected in the recent parliamentary resolution in support of West Bank annexation that had no operative impact other than to validate the worst instincts of Israel's critics and worsen Israel's already strained ties with key communities of friends. But the deeper reality is that the second intifada and two decades of diplomatic stalemate followed by the trauma of October 7 have turned the vast Israeli center against the two-state solution.

If France, Britain, and Canada truly wanted to advance the idea of a negotiated resolution of the Israel-Palestinian conflict, they missed a prime opportunity to address the legitimate fears and concerns of ordinary Israelis, without whose support the idea of Palestinian statehood will never come to pass. One good place to start would have been to convince Abbas to fulfill that "fundamental condition" for Palestinian statehood that Netanyahu himself set out sixteen years ago—recognition of Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people. (Mosaic Aug 14)

The Media's Ponzi Scheme of Lies By Melanie Phillips

In the Gaza war, journalism has become a veritable Ponzi scheme of lies. It uses terrorists posing as journalists to tell lies, it lies about the evidence that they were terrorists and it lies about those lying about the lies.

Israel said it had conducted a targeted killing of the al Jazeera "journalist" Anas al Sharif because he was also a Hamas commander. It produced screen shots identifying al Sharif as a leader in a Hamas rocket-launching squad and member of the Nukhba force, the stormtroopers who led the depraved attack on Israelis on October 7 2023. It showed that he had joined Hamas in 2013 and even revealed his military ID number.

It further emerged that al Sharif was named in a lawsuit by American victims of October 7 against al Jazeera for providing "substantial assistance" to Hamas. The lawsuit quotes messages al Sharif posted on Telegram on October 7 as the massacre of 1200 Israelis developed. He wrote in one message "Nine hours later and the heroes are still roaming the country, killing and capturing... God, God, how great you are."

He wrote in another "It is a jihad, a jihad of victory and martyrdom. Allahu akbar and thank God."

Before the attack, Sharif posted photos of himself smiling alongside Hamas leaders, including the eliminated October 7 mastermind Yahya Sinwar.

None of that cut any ice with Western media outlets that vilified Israel for targeting a journalist. Instead, the media dismissed all this evidence with declarations that Israel's claims couldn't be verified and that it had provided "no proof".

In other words there is simply no evidence, however overwhelming, that is allowed to challenge the foundational lie pumped out by the media echo-chamber that the Israelis are brutal killers mowing down the innocent for daring to resist.

So the media went into mourning for their slain champion of "truth", presenting that view of al Sharif as unchallengeably correct while ignoring or rubbishising as an Israeli cover-up the evidence that he was a senior Hamas operative.

As Honest Reporting noted, Sky News lauded al Sharif as a "crucial reporting voice," ignoring the IDF evidence of his affiliation to Hamas. AP stated that Israel had produced no facts, asserting that Israel had said, "without producing evidence, that al-Sharif had led a Hamas cell". Reuters also declared that Israel did not disclose any evidence. The New York Times eulogised al-Sharif by saying "he and other al Jazeera reporters have become symbols of the determination to broadcast reports about the war and conditions in that enclave to the Arab world," and downplaying Israel's evidence as mere accusations.

And The Guardian lamented: "The truth has died" — which would appear for once to be an accurate observation, but of The Guardian's own reporting.

Remarkably, the BBC actually published something that contradicted this mass lament over a fallen hero by coyly slipping in “The BBC understands Sharif did some work with a Hamas media team in Gaza before the current war.”

What?! But wait: in the next sentence it added “In social media videos before his death Sharif can be heard criticising the group.”

Phew, eh?! Apparently we can all relax. Al Sharif was kind of associated with Hamas, but he was also kind of not. And note “criticising,” as if Hamas was nothing more than a politics debating society.

Indeed, that seems to be the view of none other than the president of the Foreign Press Association, Ian Williams, who remarkably declared “Frankly, I don’t care whether al Sharif was in Hamas or not. We don’t kill journalists for being Republicans or Democrats.”

Well, if the president of the Foreign Press Association thinks a terrorist group that slaughters, rapes, beheads, burns alive, tortures and takes hostage innocent people is the same kind of thing as an American political party, who can be surprised that the journalists he represents view Hamas genocidists as professional colleagues?

Moreover, al Jazeera isn’t a media outfit that just happens to employ some terrorists. It is the propaganda arm of Qatar, the Muslim Brotherhood Islamist regime that’s the sponsor and protector of Hamas, the foe of moderate Muslim states and which wages jihad by stealth against Israel and the west.

Al Jazeera itself is a key asset in the jihadis’ use of “asymmetric warfare”. This transforms propaganda from being merely an adjunct of war into a key strategy of warfare that has weaponised information to manipulate the ignorance, credulousness and profound hatred of Jews in the west to bring about the destruction of Israel that the Islamists can’t achieve by military means.

Al Jazeera is the Islamists’ principal weapon in the war of information that they are waging with such devastating effect to twist the already degraded and demoralised western mind into believing that evil is good and good is evil.

As Collin Anderson of the Washington Free Beacon reported “Over the decades, al Jazeera has published a number of false reports accusing Israel of atrocities. A 2013 story charged Israel with opening dams to intentionally flood Gaza. Al Jazeera retracted that reporting two years later, issuing an embarrassing editor’s note that acknowledged there “are no dams of the type which can be opened.

“Years later, al Jazeera corrected a report that referred to the Israeli coastal city of Haifa as “northern occupied Palestine”. Al Sharif was not the only al Jazeera “journalist” mentioned in the declassified Israeli documents that revealed al Sharif’s Hamas affiliation. Also referenced were Alaa Salama, Hossam Shabat, Ashraf al Saraj, Ismail Abu Omar, and Talal Aruki, all of whom are affiliated with either Hamas or Palestinian Islamic Jihad, according to the documents.”

Al Jazeera has played a central role in framing the Gaza war in such a way that it’s now a mainstream belief that Israel commits war crimes, starves children to death and targets for assassination those who are heroically bringing the truth to light — all an eye-popping inversion of the truth.

The western media commonly pass off terrorists as journalists. Last year, Lahav Harkov reported that one third of the Arab journalists listed by the Committee to Protect Journalists as having been killed in the Gaza war were employed by terrorist groups. The head of Reporters Without Borders US admitted that it used different criteria for identifying Gazans as bona fide journalists because they were “trapped inside the territory, within a wider context of targeting the press”.

Whether or not editors and news desks realise they are platforming terrorists and their supporters, the media use them because they deliver the malicious and false narrative of Israeli abuses and Palestinian victimisation that must not be challenged.

The media act in concert with the human rights and humanitarian establishment, which is similarly deployed to push blood libels against Israel to further the Islamists’ strategy of weaponised deceit. Thus Amnesty, which gave Anas al Sharif a “Human Rights Defender”

award, claimed that Israel had killed at least 242 Arab journalists in Gaza compared with a mere 69 journalists killed in World War Two — and that it had killed more journalists than in any other conflict in modern history.

This comparison is invidious, because there were far fewer journalists involved in reporting that war and statistics are deeply unreliable. That said, at least 225 Soviet journalists were reportedly killed on the Eastern Front during the war, and there are bound to have been more killed in Germany, Japan and other military theatres. And presumably, in Amnesty’s mindset the more than 1400 Jewish journalists killed between 1939 and 1945, according to Yad Vashem, don’t count as victims at all.

Do Amnesty staffers, one has to wonder, bound out of bed in the morning panting with excitement at inventing yet another vicious claim with which to stick it to the Jews and render Israel powerless to resist its own destruction?

But this onslaught is relentless and global. Adam Kredo reports in the Washington Free Beacon that the UN-affiliated Integrated Food Security Phase Classification watchdog (IPC) manipulated its own metrics to make it easier to declare famine in Gaza. In a July 29 report the IPC said “the worst-case scenario of famine is currently playing out in the Gaza Strip,” claiming that “mounting evidence shows that widespread starvation, malnutrition, and disease are driving a rise in hunger-related deaths”. Kredo writes:

The UN-affiliated watchdog group that recently declared a “worst-case scenario of famine” in Gaza quietly changed one of its key reporting metrics while doing so, making it easier to formally declare that there is a famine in the Hamas-controlled territory. One veteran aid practitioner told the Free Beacon that in previous famine declarations the IPC issued in Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan it used different metrics. For Gaza it quietly cut a key metric by half...

Media outlets like the New York Times, NPR, CNN, and ABC News relied on the IPC report to claim that Israeli policies have led to mass starvation, with the Times stating that “months of severe aid restrictions imposed by Israel on the territory” have caused a famine “across most of Gaza”.

Of course they did. The Western media front in this war has been deployed to pump out first the libel of Israeli genocide, then the libel that Israel deliberately targets hospitals, then the libel that Israel is starving children to death, then the libel that Israel is deliberately killing aid workers and Gazans queuing for food, and now the libel that Israel is deliberately targeting for assassination the journalists heroically trying to bring these crimes to light.

As a result, countless numbers of people are now absolutely convinced they have “seen” the evidence of all this. It never occurs to them to ask the obvious questions: how come the “starving” children they have “seen” begging piteously for food are obviously well fed; how come the adults they have seen with them ditto; how come they have not seen large numbers of people with bellies swollen from malnutrition; how come Israel is supposed to be starving the Gazans when it’s supplied them with tens of thousands of tons of food; and so on and on.

The evidence that’s actually playing out before us is of millions of people being manipulated and lied to. It’s utterly shocking how so many can be implacably convinced that black is white. They believe it because they want to — as the Islamists understand very well. That’s why the strategy is so wicked. It has cleverly weaponised the profound desire in the West to be rid once and for all of the Jews’ historic victim status which lies so heavily on the Western conscience; and the desire also, at an even deeper level, to be rid of the Jews themselves.

It is a brilliant, diabolical strategy, it is poisoning an entire society and the media is its instrument. Rather than exposing the abuse of power, journalism has itself become an abuse of power.

The scale of this exercise in global manipulation to advance an agenda of sheer evil, and the extent to which it has succeeded, is beyond belief and should terrify us all. (Substack Aug 13)