



Jerusalem 6:18
Toronto 7:27

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

were not welcome at
the Venice Film
Festival.

Those who believe the pro-Palestinian propaganda have been infected with a dangerous virus and are no longer able to look fairly at reality. They do not believe any fact-based truths

where Israel is concerned. This is as frightening as it is true, as there seems to be nothing that pro-Israel advocates can do to stop the blood libels of genocide or famine.

I do not know how, when, or even if Israel will be able to redeem its reputation. But that may be irrelevant. Israel resides in the Middle East, where it is far safer to be feared than loved and far more important to be seen as militarily victorious, as a "strong man," than as a weak or vulnerable nation. Therefore, despite the horrendous price, Israel must win a total military victory against Hamas/Qatar/Iran. (JNS Sep 3)

Commentary...

Better to be Seen as the Strong Man By Phyllis Chesler

In 2023, I advised colleagues not to show the video that Hamas filmed of their sadistic murders on Oct. 7, certainly not at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. I said that the sight of Jewish blood always unleashes denial and even more Jew-hatred.

Soon enough, I also understood that the sight of Jewish military prowess unleashes even more Jew-hatred. As Israel fought to ensure that Hamas could not make good on their threat of even more Oct. 7-style attacks on Israeli soil and displayed an extraordinary command of technology in terms of its pinpoint strikes against Hezbollah, the Houthis and their paymaster, a near-nuclear Iran, the entire world condemned Israel, not Hamas, as "genocidal" and accused Israel of causing a famine in Gaza.

Jewish and Israeli compassion, coupled with high ethical standards, made no difference. Even as Israel expertly minimized the civilian-to-combatant ratio in Gaza and provided food and aid to Gazans so that no one starved, the entire world still loudly condemned Israel.

That's because the propaganda "fix" was already long in place.

Since the late 1950s, Soviet Russia, left-wing Western billionaires and Islamists everywhere have royally funded the business of brainwashing Westerners. Thus, at the sight of Jewish blood and Israeli military might, wealthy and well-educated people, as well as illiterate, vulgar mobs of Muslims, marched against Israel on every continent and menaced Jews individually. The academics and the arts community, with their glitterati-signed petitions and letters, urged that Israeli individuals and the country itself be boycotted. Many stopped traffic and university classes in North America and Europe to "free Palestine."

Not a word was uttered about freeing the Israeli hostages being buried alive and tortured somewhere along the 300 miles of weaponized Hamas tunnels, beneath mosques, hospitals, schools and homes in Gaza. Not a word about the now 901 Israelis who died in battle or about the countless number of Israelis who've been wounded or displaced, or about the Israeli civilians who've been traumatized for life.

Not a word about the nine-front war that Israel has been forced to fight against: (1) rocket-launching jihadists in Gaza, (2) Hezbollah in Lebanon, (3) the Houthis, (4) terrorists in Yehuda and Shomron, (5) Qatar and Iran, (6) the global cognitive war against Israel, (7) Israel-based jihadists and (8) Israeli dissidents who have chosen this time in history to attempt to bring the government down. These dissidents hate their own government more than they hate Hamas or Iran. Then there are the Jews outside of Israel (9), including some rabbis, who have also chosen this moment to berate Israel for crimes it has not committed, but really, for the crime of making them vulnerable and unpopular.

If you count the anti-Israel resolutions being passed by the United Nations, European leaders and academic associations all over the world, you could say that Israel is fighting a 10-front war. The Jew-hating "Free Palestine" mobs never note this 10-against-one ratio, but then they are far from even-handed or "proportional" in their perspective.

Let's not forget that almost immediately after Oct. 7, physical and even murderous attacks against Jews outside of Israel began, or really, simply continued, only louder and larger. These attacks targeted visible Jews on American college campuses, in the streets, outside of synagogues and at Jewish centers. The anti-Israel mobs aimed at anyone speaking Hebrew on vacation in Europe; reservations were not honored, meals were not served, doors were shut, ships ferrying Israeli tourists to Greece were not allowed to dock, and Israeli superstars

Why I Prayed on the Temple Mount on the Morning of my Wedding By Rabbi Leo Dee

On the morning of Aug. 31, 2025, I found myself standing on the Temple Mount (Har Habayit) in Jerusalem. That night, I would be standing under the chuppah at my wedding, smashing a glass to remember the destruction of our holiest place. That glass is supposed to symbolize brokenness.

But here's the thing I've learned in the two-plus years since the tragedy that took my wife and two young daughters: commemorating brokenness is never enough.

Because life is like walking up a down escalator. The moment you stop moving, you start sliding downward. Standing still is not an option—not for me, not for Israel and not for the Jewish people.

For me, rehabilitation has meant three things: a dream, an action, and a recovery. My personal recovery began a year ago when I started dating again and the action comes later today when I marry my beautiful bride, Aliza. But my dream—my dream is bigger than myself, bigger than my children. It's about the Jewish people, the State of Israel, the ongoing war and the hostages still held in Gaza.

This is the paradox we are living through: this war won't be won by more attacks on Gaza, though they may be justified. It won't be won by negotiating with terrorists, which is unjustified.

And it certainly won't be won by chanting "Bring them Home" on the streets of Europe, America or Israel. It will end only when we do the one thing we've avoided for the past 60 years: reassert Jewish sovereignty over our holiest site—the Temple Mount.

Think about it. For two millennia, Jews have prayed to return to Jerusalem and in our liturgy, that phrase overwhelmingly means one thing: The Temple Mount. Our prophets said that the Temple would be rebuilt, while Christians and Muslims believe their Messiah will only come when that happens. The only ones who seem to doubt the prophets are the Jews themselves.

History has a funny way of nudging us. When Jews don't act, God creates conditions where we have no choice. When we are divided, our enemies attack, forcing us to unite. When we ignore the Temple Mount, God allows Hamas to brand their war "The Al Aqsa Flood"—a reminder of what we should really be fighting for.

When we fail to free our holiest hostage—the Temple Mount—God prevents us from freeing our flesh-and-blood hostages.

So yes, I climbed up to Temple Mount with a dream: that it would soon be ours once more. Because the day we take it back, the day we free our oldest hostage, that's the day we'll also free all the others.

In the words of King David in Shir Hama'alot, "We will be like dreamers."

Among my prayers today is the hope that our leaders will soon choose this option—for the sake of Israel, for the sake of our people and for the speedy return of our hostages. (JNS Aug 31)

The writer married Aliza Teplitsky, who was born and raised in Toronto/Thornhill, in Israel this week. They will live in Efrat with Leo's three surviving children, Keren, Tali and Yehuda.

Trumping a ‘Conjectural Palestinian State’ at the UNGA

By Ruthie Blum

Kudos to the administration in Washington for its dramatic announcement on Friday—ahead of the 80th session of the United Nations General Assembly—that it is denying and revoking visas for members of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Authority. In other words, neither P.A. leader Mahmoud Abbas nor his entourage of bad actors will be able to travel to New York City to attend the annual event they’d been anticipating with such glee.

Naturally. This year, the chief terrorist-in-a-tie in Ramallah wasn’t merely going to be showered with accolades. He was going to be honored by a number of Western countries declaring their intention to recognize the “State of Palestine.”

First among these paragons of immoral political expediency was French President Emmanuel Macron, who came out of this proverbial closet on July 24. Next in line was British Prime Minister Keir Starmer, who followed suit on July 29.

Then came Canadian Prime Minister Mark Carney and Malta’s Robert Adela on July 30. Australia’s premier, Anthony Albanese, joined the dubious club on Aug. 11. Yet all were a bit late to the endeavor, since Norway, Spain and Ireland were the trailblazers in May 2024. Much to the delight of Hamas, by the way.

Notable about the handful of left-leaning heads of government is their desperate attempt to remain relevant internationally, while catering domestically to a growing anti-Israel sentiment and/or Islamist electorate. This isn’t how they frame their stunt, of course.

No, they profess to be on the side of, you know, “peace” in the Mideast by way of a “two-state solution.” This is code for massive Israeli territorial concessions to an entity sworn to the annihilation of the Jews. One whose henchmen and fellow travelers in Gaza perpetrated the Oct. 7 massacre, and whose counterparts in Judea and Samaria have yet to condemn the atrocities of that Black Sabbath nearly two years ago.

This makes sense. Though the rulers in Ramallah are rivals of Hamas, which is wildly popular in the P.A., they encourage, fund and reward that group’s terrorists.

They also issue the antisemitic textbooks used in schools to indoctrinate Palestinian-Arab children to glorify martyrdom in the name of Allah—for anyone who murders Jews and Israelis. And let’s not forget that the institutions of such learning in Gaza are run by the U.N. Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for so-called “Palestinian refugees.”

These are the only refugees in the world with a special status that perpetuates their plight, rather than alleviating it through permanent resettlement. Not surprisingly, the very bleeding hearts who claim to care about human rights ignore this travesty. Or welcome it.

After all, it’s far more lucrative financially and beneficial ideologically to buy into and spread the propaganda that Israel is at fault. And this is despite the repeated efforts by the Jewish state to meet the conditions of both friends and foes ranting about the need for Israel to remove the “obstacles” responsible for a lack of peace with the Palestinians.

Instead of acknowledging that every Israeli peace overture and goodwill gesture has increased Palestinians’ incentive to destroy Israel, Western liberals—including Jewish ones at home and abroad—have spent decades doubling down on their belief in failed policies.

This can be chalked up to naïve “kumbaya” fantasies or genuine malevolence aimed purposely in the wrong direction. Macron, Starmer, Carney, Adela and Albanese no longer deserve the benefit of the doubt, if they ever warranted it, about which of the two categories best describes them.

Just observe how quick they were to vilify Israel for fighting the jihadists who invaded the country on the Simchat Torah weekend in 2023 and went on a slaughter spree.

Their championing of Palestinian statehood was simply another way of pouring salt in Israel’s literal and figurative wounds.

Had Kamala Harris won the U.S. presidential election in November, the United States may have jumped on this bandwagon, as well. Though more symbolic than concrete, it’s significant in terms of how Israel and the P.A. continue to be perceived and treated.

By nixing the entry of the latter into America for the UNGA, President Donald Trump is conveying just as much of a powerful

message to the gang of Western terrorism apologists who’d planned on hailing Abbas in the halls of the United Nations as to those denied the visas.

The State Department’s Office of the Spokesperson worded the warning, in part, as follows: “The Trump Administration has been clear: It is in our national security interests to hold the PLO and P.A. accountable for not complying with their commitments, and for undermining the prospects for peace. Before [they] can be considered partners for peace, they must consistently repudiate terrorism—including the Oct. 7 massacre—and end incitement to terrorism in education, as required by U.S. law and as promised by the PLO.”

In addition, the statement went on, “The P.A. must ... end its attempts to bypass negotiations through international lawfare campaigns, including appeals to the ICC [International Criminal Court] and ICJ [International Court of Justice], and efforts to secure the unilateral recognition of a conjectural Palestinian state. Both steps materially contributed to Hamas’s refusal to release its hostages, and to the breakdown of the Gaza ceasefire talks.” [Emphasis added.]

However, it concluded, signaling a way forward the likelihood of which is nil, “The United States remains open to re-engagement that is consistent with our laws, should the P.A./PLO meet their obligations and demonstrably take concrete steps to return to a constructive path of compromise and peaceful coexistence with the State of Israel.”

It remains to be seen whether some U.N. maneuver will override the administration’s decree. But the outcry it evoked in anti-Israel circles indicates how brilliant and crucial a move it was. (JNS Aug 31)

Hitler is a Genocide Scholar? By Amit Segal

Adolf Hitler and Emperor Palpatine recently joined the International Association of Genocide Scholars—yes, the very same “world leading association of genocide scholars” that made international headlines by accusing Israel of committing genocide in Gaza. If you think I’m joking, I’m not—at least, not entirely.

After the IAGS’ Israel-genocide declaration spread around the globe, Honest Reporting board member Salo Aizenberg decided to do some digging, and what he found was astonishing: anyone can join the IAGS—you just have to pay \$30. And as we can see by Hitler and Palpatine’s membership, the IAGS doesn’t even vet that its members are alive—or if they’re a character from Star Wars.

Once Aizenberg revealed his discovery and his new membership to the association on X, others followed suit. Some, such as Aizenberg and Eitan Fischberger, signed up as themselves. And some, well, didn’t.

Thankfully, not all of the association’s new members were villains—both real and made up. The Cookie Monster also joined the IAGS.

To call this embarrassing for a so-called world leading group of experts is an understatement. And while it calls into question the qualifications of the IAGS’ real members, there are also serious concerns around the actual vote on the genocide resolution.

For starters, as The Free Press noted, “80 of the 500 members of IAGS all claim to be based in Iraq—a country not known for universities with robust genocide scholarship.”

But even if we give the Iraqi scholars the benefit of the doubt—how many IAGS members actually voted for the genocide resolution? 108, a mere 21.6 percent. So how on earth did it pass? It only needed support from two-thirds of those voting—and only 129 people voted.

Don’t believe me? Ask Emily Sample, the association’s communications officer. As you can see below, prior to the vote, she wrote to IAGS members that “for the resolution to pass, it requires a 2/3 majority from a quorum of at least 20% + 1 of all paid-up IAGS members.”

Suffice to say, this discovery has trashed the IAGS’ credibility. But it’s not all doom and gloom for the organization. With Hitler having joined, it can finally boast having a real genocide expert in its ranks. Given the group’s eagerness to demonize the Jewish state, I’m confident he’ll fit right in. (It’s Noon in Israel Sep 4)

IDF Action in Lebanon Allows Northern Israeli Residents to Return By Yaakov Lappin

After the new school year began in Israel on Sept. 1, a fragile sense of normalcy is returning to the country's northern border, with a Walla report on that day stating that some 76% of residents displaced by the war with Hezbollah have now returned to their homes.

This return has been enabled not only by a massive degradation of Hezbollah's capabilities during Operation Northern Arrows (Sept. to Nov. 2024), but also by a new and proactive Israeli security doctrine. This has seen the IDF strike Hezbollah targets almost daily, thwarting the Lebanese terror militia's efforts to rebuild its capabilities.

In Beirut, meanwhile, the Lebanese government's recent moves have been aimed at Hezbollah's disarmament, but this effort is undermined by a weak army, including its Shi'ite personnel, some of whom are complicit with Hezbollah. The Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF) is unable to force Hezbollah to disarm without triggering a civil war that it has no confidence of winning.

An assessment from an Israeli security official detailed the devastating blow inflicted on Hezbollah during Operation Northern Arrows, which created the conditions for the current security situation. According to the assessment, the operation eliminated between 4,000 to 5,000 Hezbollah commanders and operatives, with another 9,000 removed (killed or wounded) from its combat reserves.

The terror group's elite Radwan commando force was rendered "not fit for a large-scale offensive operation," with all of its frontline invasion infrastructure dismantled. The IDF also destroyed between 70% and 80% of Hezbollah's short-range rocket launchers, meaning that Hezbollah's ability to attack Israel with rockets and missiles has been reduced to "sporadic, isolated launches."

The IDF has dismantled approximately 1,500 underground infrastructure sites, including all offensive cross-border tunnels. With the ceasefire that followed, the Israeli military established its new doctrine of "forward defense," operating from five outposts inside the southern Lebanese buffer zone.

The IDF works to strike remaining terror infrastructure, restrict the movement of Hezbollah operatives, and prevent the group from rebuilding its capabilities south of the Litani River. The ongoing strikes, such as the one on September 1 against engineering equipment being used to rehabilitate terror infrastructure in Yaroun and Ramyah, are a direct application of this proactive doctrine.

Col. (ret.) Dr. Jacques Neria, a Middle East specialist at the Jerusalem Center for Security and Foreign Affairs and a former deputy head for assessment of Israeli Military Intelligence, told JNS, "The ability of the Lebanese government to operate its army against Hezbollah is extremely limited because of the danger of deteriorating into a civil war. They will prefer any compromise over a military confrontation with Hezbollah."

Neria argued that Israel's current proactive posture is essential to preventing Hezbollah's recovery. "It must be assumed that as long as the IDF is on guard and striking Hezbollah, the chance that it will be able to deploy heavy weapons against Israel is low. However, if it adopts a guerrilla strategy while we are in the south, this will make it difficult for us. A total cessation of IDF operations will bring the Radwan force to the border again," he warned.

Neria also cautioned against an over-extension of Israel's ground presence, advising against a new, large-scale security zone. "Apart from precise raids following precise intelligence, it is recommended that the IDF not begin an adventure of creating a security zone," he stated.

The ongoing political moves in Beirut, such as a recent meeting between the Lebanese president and prime minister to discuss the disarmament of Hezbollah plan are seen by many observers as largely symbolic.

A report in the pro-Hezbollah newspaper Al-Liwaa noted that the LAF plan was a "general" one with no operational activity until a political consensus is reached, a consensus that is unlikely ever to materialize.

Professor Eyal Zisser, vice rector of Tel Aviv University and chair of contemporary history of the Middle East, argued that while the IDF's actions are making it difficult for Hezbollah, they are not

delivering a decisive blow.

"The IDF's activity helps to make it difficult for Hezbollah to rebuild its capabilities, but it is doubtful whether in the long run there is a fundamental and long-term solution here, unless Israel escalates and expands the scope of its operations and these become more massive," Zisser told JNS.

He added, "Hezbollah has preserved many of its capabilities; it has thousands of armed operatives and part of its projectile arsenal. So our activity harasses and makes it difficult for it, but does not really damage its capabilities."

Zisser stated that if Hezbollah attempts to re-establish its presence in southern Lebanon, massive Israeli air activity and likely ground operations would be required, if the Lebanese army would let Hezbollah return to the area.

"The Lebanese government is trying [to counter Hezbollah] and wants to, but we are talking about intentions, not actual implementation," he said. "The army is torn. Sixty percent of its soldiers are Shi'ites, so it would definitely prefer that everything be done amicably and not in confrontation. The army is trying to hold on where it can, but without a confrontation that challenges Hezbollah, whose interest for now is to keep its head down. For good intentions, the government in Beirut gets a 10. For actual implementation, it gets an insufficient grade." (JNS Sep 4)

Jerry Nadler and the Moral Collapse of American Jewish Liberals By Jonathan S. Tobin

There was a time when Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-N.Y.) could be counted on as a stalwart defender of the Jewish state. I know this because I heard him speak at a street-corner, pro-Israel demonstration across from the United Nations in the late 1980s. Those were during the dark days of the First Intifada, when it was becoming clear that fashionable liberal political opinion started turning on Israel as it coped with violent Palestinian demonstrations within and around its borders. Even though The New York Times editorial page and other outlets popular in his Manhattan constituency were denouncing Jerusalem's efforts to cope with the situation, Nadler turned up to express his solidarity.

That was a long time ago. But as the 78-year-old announced this week that he won't run for a 17th term in Congress, it is difficult to square the sentiments I heard from him that day with the political figure he eventually became.

That was made obvious in July when, rather than showing up to support the Jewish state, he joined a protest against Israel's just war of self-defense, outside the Israeli consulate in New York City, organized by the viciously anti-Israel group T'ruah.

Nadler is best known to most Americans because of his four years as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee from 2019 to 2023 and for stage-managing two separate impeachments of President Donald Trump. His truculent attitude during his time in the spotlight seemed to embody the hyper-partisan spirit of the moment for both liberals and conservatives. A knee-jerk opposition to Trump and the Republicans on every conceivable issue played well among Democrats, especially at home on Manhattan's Upper West Side. He's even garnering applause from liberal pundits for his retirement announcement because of his recognition that his party's tradition, in which geriatrics hold onto power at the expense of younger people, and, as with the example of President Joe Biden, past the point where they are competent, is something that needs to end.

His relinquishing of a safe, deep-blue House seat where the GOP barely exists has set off a feeding frenzy among Democratic politicians and celebrities, including Chelsea Clinton, eager to succeed him. But the graceful manner in which he is exiting office may be the best thing that can be said about the end of his career. While he may have been willing to stand up for Israel three and a half decades ago, at the moment of greatest peril for American Jewry and the Jewish state, he has deserted their cause.

In the two years since the Hamas-led Palestinian attacks on Israeli communities on Oct. 7, 2023, Nadler has provided a troubling example of how prominent liberal Democrats have chosen to side

with the Jewish state's foes. He showed that his priority was staying in sync with the leftist base of his party and not in defending Jews during the unprecedented surge in antisemitism post-Oct. 7. He defended prominent Jew-haters like Mahmoud Khalil, organizer of the pro-Hamas mobs at Columbia University, in his own district. He opposed administration efforts to force Columbia and other universities to end their toleration and encouragement of antisemitism on their campuses. And, even as he declared himself to still be a supporter of Israel, he joined those who were mainstreaming Hamas propaganda about the current war, as well as echoing the blood libels about the Jewish state and its government being guilty of mass slaughter and war crimes, even supporting an arms embargo on it.

On top of that, this summer Nadler endorsed New York state assemblyman Zohran Mamdani, a Democratic Socialist and virulent antisemite, after he won the Democratic mayoral primary in June. While many of his neighbors in what some wags call the "People's Republic of the Upper West Side" fear for their futures in the world's greatest Jewish city, Nadler was smoothing the path to victory for a man who thinks there's nothing wrong with chants advocating for Jewish genocide and the destruction of Israel ("From the river to the sea") and terrorism against Jews ("Globalize the intifada").

Why did Nadler go down this path?

Unlike many of his colleagues in the current Democratic caucus, Nadler had tried, as The New York Times noted, "to stake out space for a politics that was both pro-Israel and progressive." While that may have worked in an earlier era when talk of a bipartisan pro-Israel consensus was more descriptive than aspirational, Nadler's career arc demonstrates that the two categories are no longer compatible. In fact, they are now mutually exclusive.

Nadler and others blame this on Israel and its prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu. Of course, the leader of the Jewish state and its government are not exempt from criticism; however, what's happened within the Democratic Party has very little to do with the actions of either. The so-called explanation for their alienation is their becoming disillusioned with Israeli policies. But the truth is that they are following the lead of progressives who have always been against Israel's existence. That is the product of the left's embrace of the toxic myths of critical race theory, intersectionality and settler-colonialism that branded Israel and Jews as "white oppressors," who are always in the wrong and must therefore be brought down.

As we saw in the days, weeks and months since Oct. 7, the rationale of those opposed to Israel's just war to eradicate Hamas had more to do with a belief that Israel must simply accept the continued presence on its southern border of an Islamist terrorist entity pledged to repeat those unspeakable atrocities. Their criticisms of efforts by the Jewish state to root out these genocidal murderers were untethered to any actual evidence of war crimes, let alone "genocide," based on repetitions of the lies told by Hamas operatives and their enablers.

Even worse, this stand involved a willingness to rationalize and excuse the way the pro-Hamas movement in the United States was engaged in acts of blatant antisemitic intimidation and violence. At a time when more and more Jews felt themselves under attack, even in institutions like Columbia, where they felt most at home, some Democrats, such as Nadler and Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), claimed to be their defenders. But rather than helping to stem the tide of hate, they were still primarily focused on attacking Trump, even as he was doing more to combat antisemitism than they had ever done.

Perhaps not even a great man could have reversed the trend. But an independent thinker might have stubbornly sought to oppose the way his party's base had succumbed to the far left in a way that would have been unthinkable back when Nadler was speaking in Israel's defense on New York street corners.

For all of his obvious skill in holding onto office, no one has ever accused Nadler of independent thinking, let alone greatness.

Nadler is a classic example of a career politician. First elected to the New York State Assembly in 1976 at age 29, he spent the next decade and a half in a dogged pursuit of higher office, losing races for Manhattan Borough President and New York City Controller before finally winning a House seat in 1992. Since then, he has never faced

serious opposition, though it was clear that he might be vulnerable to a younger, even more leftist primary challenger in 2026.

His story, though, is more than that of a typical political hack. His journey from being a stalwart pro-Israel liberal to his current stance, in which he cowardly follows the political fashion of the day, even if it means mimicking pro-Hamas talking points, provides insight into a similar path being pursued by many American Jews.

If many liberals are now distancing themselves from Israel, it is not so much a result of their horror at the spectacle of Israel being forced to fight a war against a foe determined to sacrifice its own population on the altar of their perverted cause. Rather, it is a product of the way partisanship has overwhelmed all other concerns for them and so many other Americans.

When being pro-Israel was seen as compatible with being a Democrat or even a natural position for someone in the party to take, there was no cost in doing so. But once the voices on the intersectional left became the loudest on that side of the aisle, politicians like Nadler began to back away from their former stances.

That was accelerated once Trump came down the escalator and into American lives in 2015. So great is the antagonism to the 45th/47th president that it became impossible for liberal Democrats to make common cause with him, even when he did things that they had long advocated for, such as moving the U.S. embassy to Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Nadler was a longtime supporter of the move; nevertheless, when Trump finally did it, he joined with the Israel-haters of J Street to oppose it.

Even worse, Nadler switched positions on the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA)'s widely accepted working definition of antisemitism. Initially, a sponsor of the Antisemitism Awareness Act enshrining it into American law, he eventually opposed it. His disingenuous protestations notwithstanding, he did only so because Trump had embraced it, and to make it safe for fellow Democrats like Reps. Ilhan Omar (D-Minn.) and Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.), as well as Mamdani, to avoid being properly labeled as the Jew-haters they are.

Trump's rise has set off a general realignment in American politics where working-class voters of all races are leaving the Democrats for the GOP, with credentialed elites moving in the opposite direction. The overwhelming majority of Jews have been a dependable voting bloc for Democrats for the last century. Such partisan loyalty fits neatly into the current political framework since they are among those elements of the population most likely to be college-educated and therefore leaning left.

But the events of the last two years have also created a dilemma for American Jews. Some longtime Democrats now recognize that, as much as they have differences with Trump and most Republicans, on the one issue that is most directly connected to their safety and that of their fellow Jews here and in Israel, they are outside of their party's new consensus.

That presents them with a difficult choice in which they must decide which is their priority: staying loyal to the Democrats and prioritizing their hatred for Trump, or holding their noses and stepping away from a party that is more and more on the side of those seeking Israel's destruction and enabling antisemitism in the United States.

Those who choose the latter exemplify the moral collapse of a brand of American liberalism that is incapable of defending its values against illiberal and antisemitic progressives who are willing to consign Jews to the status of an unprotected and despised "oppressor" minority.

We know what choice Jerry Nadler made as he put his finger up to the wind in recent years. He abandoned a principled pro-Israel position to pursue the favor of a party base that swallowed the big lie about the Palestinian war to destroy the only Jewish state on the planet being the moral equivalent of the struggle for civil rights in America. While a significant number of Jewish liberals are beginning to understand that their political home is rejecting them, many others, like Nadler, have chosen their party over the fight against antisemitism. (JNS Sep 3)
